

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TIME OF MEMORIES HERE FOR
MAMIE

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, today, November 14, 1973, is the birthdate anniversary of Mamie Doud Eisenhower.

I have the high honor and privilege of claiming Mamie as a constituent for, as all of us know, she resides in historic Gettysburg, Pa.

Birthdays always seem to suggest age, because they are a measure of time. However, in Mamie's case an exception can be claimed, for it can be said that she is, in truth, 77 years young.

She is very active, both around her home and in community affairs. She receives a heavy stream of correspondence from all parts of the world, and much of her time is spent in answering this.

She is also active in club and social work, contributing a great deal of her time to drives designed to accomplish real social services. While she is not eager to accept speaking engagements, she never turns aside any worthwhile causes.

Mamie Doud Eisenhower is a remarkable and charming woman, and I join with the host of people from all over the world in extending her a happy birthday greeting. May the years before her reflect the happy and meaningful years of the past.

An article that appeared in the October 7, 1973, issue of the Sunday Patriot-News of Harrisburg provides some highly interesting background information on Mamie Doud Eisenhower. On this occasion of her birthday, I submit this article to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

REMEMBER INTEGRITY, SHE ASKS: TIME OF MEMORIES HERE FOR MAMIE

(By Harry McLaughlin)

GETTYSBURG.—Mamie Doud Eisenhower, who four years and seven months ago was widowed by the death of President Dwight D. Eisenhower, hopes future generations will remember him for his "honesty, integrity and patriotism."

One week from today, world attention again will be focused on the anniversary salute to Ike's 83rd birthday. His friends and neighbors, however, will celebrate it on Thursday, Oct. 18, at Gettysburg College.

In a written reply to questions answered exclusively for the Sunday Patriot-News, Mrs. Eisenhower lists "the freedom to live in her own home—after the White House years" as one of her cherished moments.

Mrs. Eisenhower, who will celebrate her own 77th birthday on Nov. 14, especially noted two cherished moments:

"When Gen. Eisenhower received his first star; and at Columbia University, the satisfaction it gave my husband to deal with young folks."

The former First Lady never has a boring day. Just keeping up with her mail from friends, and answering letters with the assistance of her personal secretary, Mrs. Ethel M. Wetzel, could cover an eight-hour session. She has an office in the Gettysburg Post Office building.

Mrs. Eisenhower "rings for her breakfast at 8:30 a.m." at her farm home near here, although she often awakes an hour earlier.

"Do you like to maintain a busy schedule?" she was asked.

Mrs. Eisenhower, in reply, said that she likes a busy schedule, but does conserve her strength.

Gen. Eisenhower rested at noon after his luncheon, she recalled.

Does Mrs. Eisenhower have special hobbies? She answered in the negative. She does have a kitchen garden and a rose garden but she doesn't work in either one herself.

As for acceptance of invitations to participate in civic or related projects, Gettysburg's first citizen said she gets all kinds of requests, and "will accept anything that is a worthy project."

Mrs. Eisenhower is active in the Gettysburg Chapter of the Daughters of the Revolution. She is honorary chairman of hundreds of organizations throughout the country.

After reading and answering letters (she declines face-to-face personal news media interviews), Mrs. Eisenhower relaxes by playing cards with "old friends", reading or watching television.

One of her husband's closest military friends, Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, former Supreme Allied Commander in Europe and an Ike bridge partner, will participate in a convocation marking the Eisenhower birthday anniversary at 11 a.m., Thursday, Oct. 18, at Gettysburg College Student Union building. (Gruenther was unable to be present, had the event been held Oct. 14.) The public is invited to the observance.

Friends close to the Eisenhowers remember Ike's standard procedure when touring the nation, or while abroad; he would introduce his wife this way: "Now I want you to meet my Mamie."

The late President and Mamie were extremely fond of their grandchildren, and he expressly enjoyed taking David along on the golf course. David is married to Julie Nixon, daughter of President Nixon, who was Eisenhower's vice-president.

Mrs. Eisenhower recalled that when young the grandchildren loved to put on plays and liked children's movies.

(David Eisenhower, who is presently a law school student, will be the featured speaker at the annual York-Adams County Scholastic Press Assn. conference at York's William Penn Senior High School on Tuesday afternoon, Oct. 16. He formerly attended Gettysburg High School, which is a long-time member of the school press association.)

The former First Lady said she doesn't envision any members of the Eisenhower family becoming actively engaged in politics or government.

David's name has been mentioned from time to time as a possible candidate for the U.S. House of Representative from the 19th District of York, Adams and Cumberland Counties, but he and his wife, Julie, both reject the idea—at least for the moment. They are both registered Adams County Republicans, and last Fall joined his grandmother in voting for her father for president.

"Yes," Mamie Eisenhower told The Sunday Patriot-News, she would urge "young people to enter politics."

Her late husband—Mrs. Eisenhower said assuredly—would be pleased with both the growth of Eisenhower College, in Seneca Falls, N.Y., and the success of the Eisenhower Society scholarship program at Gettysburg College.

The Eisenhower farm daily attracts many tourists, but only a few have ever seen the interior of the home, which is furnished with items the family has had for years.

All gifts from heads of state were sent to the Eisenhower Museum in Abilene, Kans.

The home and farm will become a public shrine—and operated by the National Parks Service of the U.S. Dept. of Interior—after Mrs. Eisenhower's death. She is entitled to continue to live there as long as she wishes to do so.

Mrs. Eisenhower said she will leave some of the furniture in the residence, but will give the remainder to her grandchildren, and son, John Eisenhower, who resides in Phoenixville.

PEACE FOREVER

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in many parts of the country, Veterans Day is still being commemorated on the traditional date of November 11, and this was the case in many communities in the State of Illinois.

A weekly newspaper which serves several communities in my district, the Press Publications, carried an editorial on November 11 that emphasizes the considerations that should be made for the cause of peace. The article follows:

PEACE FOREVER

There are a few strange individuals who profess to believe that by ignoring Veterans Day they are showing their disgust for warfare and killing.

But most of those who participate in such ceremonies know that of all persons, veterans are most in opposition to battle, killing and other acts of aggression.

The prisoners of war in Vietnam are fresh in our memory, and there were several from DuPage county who lived for years under strict Communist supervision. But there are many others who, in prior wars, were taken into custody and held as prisoners of war. Far too many others were killed in battle.

There are many slogans about patriotism such as "peace with honor" and "anything worth having is worth fighting for" and similar catch phrases which may sound pretty but don't have much meaning for a person being shot at.

Veterans Day is a fine time to exhibit patriotism and surely there is a great need for allegiance and support of the democratic principles that all men are created equal and endowed with certain rights which cannot be taken away from him.

This Veterans Day would be a wonderful time for every citizen to pause and take cognizance of two things.

Rights which can be conferred can almost as easily be denied. They can be denied by force of arms or in a court of law, by prejudice, fear or ignorance, by lack of concern or willingness to protect and insure them, and by many other ways.

Also, we should give serious thought not about war itself but the causes of armed conflict, the ideologies which tolerate force to impose a belief or a way of life upon unconcerned or unwilling citizens.

This Nov. 11 in the observance of Veterans Day let us think about what the veterans were fighting for, and vow that we will find peaceful methods of insuring that those goals will be met and maintained . . . peace on earth to all men . . . not just in our time but for all time.

GASOLINE MILEAGE

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, the question of gasoline mileage in relation to environmental devices placed on new model automobiles has been increasingly discussed in recent weeks. The Department of Transportation reports that consumption of gasoline this year will top 115 billion gallons in the United States, up 6 percent over 1972 and equal to about 900 gallons for each registered motor vehicle. Nonhighway use, including farming, aviation, and recreation accounts for only 3.7 billion gallons.

Certainly all of us want a clean and healthy environment. But surely our goal must be to recognize that while we protect our environment, especially within our major population centers, we must also strive to develop a system that will minimize fuel consumption. For that reason, I call attention of the Members to the recent report issued by the Environmental Protection Agency.

The Environmental Protection Agency placed 1974 automobiles on a dynamometer at the Ann Arbor, Mich., laboratory located in my district and simulated urban driving with a top speed of 57 miles per hour. While not showing some of the mechanical factors which affect gasoline mileage such as automatic transmission, engine, and carburetor size and axle ratio, the preliminary studies did reveal some striking factors which should be called to the attention of my colleagues in Congress.

The most significant factor, I believe, is that the highly publicized Mazda rotary engine in a Toya Kogyo model achieved only 12.8 miles per gallon, which was significantly less than the Ford Comet, 19.9 miles per gallon; the Plymouth compact, 16.7 miles per gallon; the Ford Maverick, 15.6 miles per gallon; the American Motors Sportabout, 15.5 miles per gallon; and the Chevrolet Nova Hatchback, 15.7 miles per gallon.

These results were achieved despite the fact the Mazda vehicle was in the 3,000-pound class compared to the 3,500-pound class of the other cars.

While it may be too early to draw specific conclusions regarding the tests because of the preliminary nature of the analysis, it does point to the fact that size alone is not a determining factor in the consideration. Indeed, the Mazda RX3 wagon, RX3 coupe, and RX2 coupe in the 2,700-pound class was able to achieve a miles-per-gallon rate only comparable to the Ford Montego wagon, even though the latter car weighed almost twice as much.

The preliminary conclusion might well be that those engines that go "hmmmm" might well have a certain detrimental factor—especially for low gas mileage—that needs further attention before it is accepted on a widespread basis.

THE AGNEW CASE: EQUAL JUSTICE?

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, former Vice President Spiro Agnew was forced to resign because of his "nolo contendere" plea to income tax evasion, but his real crime is that he undermined the basic confidence of people in our democratic institutions, which form the bedrock of this country. How can anyone who believes in equally applied justice sleep at night knowing that there are young men who are in jail for stealing a \$3,000 car, while Agnew cheated the American Government of over \$100,000 and abused the trust placed in him by the American people?

Spiro Agnew will continue to play tennis and golf and live in his \$200,000 house while others suffer.

Mr. Vernon E. Jordan, director of the Urban League, addressed this double standard of justice in his weekly syndicated column "To Be Equal" which appeared in the New York Voice on November 2, 1973. I place his column in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

DOUBLE STANDARDS AND DOUBLE TALK

(By Vernon E. Jordan, Jr.)

All the glitter and ceremony of the White House announcement of Gerald Ford's appointment to the Vice Presidency cannot cover the deep shame the Agnew case has brought to Washington, nor can it obscure the serious questions it raises about current political morality and the system of justice in America.

Coming on top of the Watergate scandals and the continuing battle over the secret White House tapes, the Agnew case is a terrible blow to the country's self-confidence and to the average citizen's faith in his leaders.

Black citizens can take no satisfaction from Mr. Agnew's removal from office. Although he was clearly one of the most unpopular national leaders in the view of black communities, there is no joy in a situation in which our national leadership, which should be strong and just, is instead shaken by corruption and greed.

DIVISIVE FORCE

From the time Mr. Agnew justified his refusal to visit and campaign in black neighborhoods by saying "once you've seen one slum you've seen them all," and continuing through his hard law and order stance and his position as a symbol of negativism on a national scale, the former Vice President has been a thorn in the side of people who hoped for policies of reconciliation instead of further divisiveness.

Now, according to a meticulously detailed bill of particulars compiled by the Justice Department, it seems that this champion of law and order was taking bribes not only as Governor of Maryland, but while occupying the second highest office in the land, one breath away from the Presidency itself. In exchange for his resignation, the government decided not to press all of these charges, allowing him to plea bargain his way out of jail by accepting one count of tax evasion, a felony that would put less mortals behind bars.

I can fully understand the government's position that it is better to allow Mr. Agnew to resign in humiliation rather than put

the country through the long ordeal of a trial and the resultant verdict and sentencing, but very few black Americans can readily accept the two-tier system of criminal justice this reflects.

High officials ought to be held to higher standards of behavior than the rest of us. Those who would lead must be worthy of that leadership. Opinion generally is that a public official on the take ought to have the book thrown at him rather than get off with a light tap on the wrists. Most people feel that when government office becomes a license to steal then the guilty ought to suffer the full penalties of the law, especially when they've hidden their own corruption behind a screen of charges of "permissiveness" and pleas to get tough with criminals.

ON THE TAKE AND ON THE LOOSE

Why, so many people are asking today, should a high official who has been on the take get off with a lesser sentence than some poor kid who took a joyride in someone else's automobile? How many thousands upon thousands of people are locked up in prison today whose crimes are so much less than those the former Vice President has been charged with?

How many thousands upon thousands of people are today on parole or probation and are forced to inform correction officials of their every movement while the former Vice President was released on his own recognizance? And how many petty criminals are caged up for months just until their trial comes up and what is their reaction to a betrayer of the public's trust getting off without ever seeing the inside of a jailhouse?

Just as the charges against Mr. Agnew corroded faith in the government, his light sentence has corroded faith in the system of criminal justice. I myself don't feel that anything would be served by locking the man up, but then justice is rarely served by locking anyone up, except perhaps for the most retrograde and violent criminals. If anything good at all is to come out of this shameful story, it is for the country to learn to extend the leniency given Mr. Agnew to the faceless thousands of accused persons whose crimes were less than his and whose fate has been far, far worse.

THE COUNTY COURIER: AN UNSELFISH COMMUNITY NEWSPAPER

HON. GOODLOE E. BYRON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. BYRON. Mr. Speaker, over the past several weeks the media has made us aware of energy conservation guidelines we can all take to save fuel. A community newspaper in my district, however, has done more than just report on the problem—it has gotten involved and is doing something about it by allowing its readers to place free "Ride Wanted" classified ads. A recent editorial said in part:

If through a free ad, you find a ride to work, then the gallons of gas saved will benefit all of us.

Mr. Speaker, the media has been criticized for many things in the past, but here is unselfish example of the good that derives when an active community newspaper works with the citizens and for the citizens it serves. The County Courier deserves our commendation and the thanks of all Americans for doing its small part in conserving our Nation's fuel.

POPULATION CONTROL MEASURES IN COMMUNIST CHINA MORE EXTREME THAN PICTURED?

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, on September 17 of this year I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a story that appeared in the Washington Star-News by Henry Bradsher entitled: "China's Sweet Talk Yields to Tough Antibaby Policy." By way of response some 23 young people in Hong Kong, who state they escaped from Red China, wrote a letter to all the Members of Congress stating that things are even worse than pictured. I have today written to Mr. Bradsher asking him to consider a followup story, based upon the letter from Hong Kong. Therefore, I am calling the statement from these young refugees to the attention of my colleagues. A translation of the letter by the Library of Congress follows:

OCTOBER 15, 1973.

[TRANSLATION]

To: Members of the United States Senate and House of Representatives.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE CONGRESS: We are a group of young people who were fortunate enough to have escaped from the Chinese Mainland to Hong Kong. As everyone knows, it is not an easy matter to escape from the iron curtain of the Mainland. In order for our group of Chinese refugees to succeed in fleeing the country, it was necessary for us to endure hunger and cold, and to travel on a journey fraught with great hardship; and it was necessary to surmount, at great risk to our lives, one obstacle after another, such as patrol guards, barbed-wire entanglements, fierce police hounds, machineguns, searchlights, patrol boats, and sharks in the open seas. Why did we make such a perilous choice? In a word, we could no longer tolerate living in the Mainland under Mao Tse-tung.

We have recently read a news dispatch in which a reporter of the Washington Star named (Henry) Bradsher, with superb effectiveness, has in the plainest language exposed one of the cruel measures of Mao Tse-tung's design, namely, to issue no food coupons for the third child in any family with more than two children. What has stirred us even more is the fact that the Honorable Representative Huber immediately requested that the entire text of this frightening news article be printed in the Congressional Record. This shows that the Members of the U.S. Congress, with their great concern for the common destiny of mankind, will not close their eyes to the dark and dismal state of the present-day world.

However, we also fervently hope that the correct stand taken by the Members of the Congress will find concrete positive expression, and that the powerful U.S. Congress, with regard to the problem of oppressed escapees, will cause the great American Government to take more positive action. In our thinking, to compare Mao Tse-tung to Hitler is to elevate Mao to too high a level. Hitler brutally carried out the genocide of the Jews; but the class enemies whom Mao Tse-tung would annihilate are countrymen of his own flesh and blood. As for using the excuse of population control to avoid issuing food coupons for the third child of a family, Bradsher's news article only reported the relatively civilized part of the story. From what we know, we can state that Mao Tse-tung is adopting the most atrocious measures of

forced sterilization to deal with young parents with more than two children. This kind of method of forced abortion and sterilization, because it is being extensively and indiscriminately promoted, has damaged the lives of an untold number of men and women. But it is only in this way that Mainland food supplies can be saved and diverted to other uses prescribed by Mao Tse-tung.

As a group of displaced refugees, we greatly appreciate the sympathy and care which the beneficent American people have shown us over a long period of time; and at a time when the voice of appeasement to the powers of evil has been spreading among nations, the U.S. Congress has been properly aroused to a vigilant and serious consideration of the matter. This rekindles in us the bright flame of hope for the future. Thus we hasten to send you this message, hoping that it will intensify the interest which Members of the Congress now have in the matter, and that they will institute a deeper investigation into questions such as these. We are unconditionally willing to provide you with concrete source materials, and we believe our protestations will be able to testify to this epochal crime.

(Signed) A group of young people who escaped from Mainland China to Hong Kong:

P'an Ta-hua, Liu Ch'i-chün, Hsiang Hao-jan, Lin Ching-chang, Li Ch'i-ts'ai, Lu Shih-lin, Li P'u-k'ao, Chiang Ts'ao, Ch'en Chen-tung, Yang Kuo-ch'ian, Kan Ling, Wei Hsiung-kuang, Ch'en Chün-ch'ü, Chi'ü Ch'eng-tsu, Ch'en K'ang-ta, Liang Ching Hua, Ch'en Fu-p'ei, Ch'en Tien-yüan, Min Chih-chang, Ou-yang Ping-ch'un, Su Kan-feng, Liu Ching-ming, Liu Hsiang-lin.

FUEL FOR THE FUTURE

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following Washington report:

FUEL FOR THE FUTURE

Recent Arab moves to slow the flow of oil to the U.S. focus attention on the development of alternative sources of energy that could free us from dependence on unreliable sources. Even without the Arab boycott, such development would be in the national interest because, no matter how efficiently the earth's remaining oil and gas deposits are used, the prospect is not encouraging that oil and gas, which now supply 75% of our current energy needs, will meet the anticipated demands of the future.

As a major part of a national energy policy, the federal government should take steps now to assure an adequate supply of energy for the future by developing new energy sources. The nation must make the same kind of commitment to this effort that put a man on the moon. The objective must be to provide the U.S., as soon as feasible, with self sufficiency in environmentally acceptable energy sources.

These are some of the more promising sources:

NUCLEAR POWER

Nuclear power, the best developed new source of energy, is at once the most promising and the most troublesome. At present, 39 nuclear-powered generating plants are in use, 55 are under construction, and 90 others are on order. Nuclear power plants already

provide about 1% of the total national demand for energy, and by 1980 they will provide about 7%.

Nuclear power is gradually overcoming a succession of difficulties, including assurance of safe operation, economic feasibility, and environmental acceptability. But other difficulties lie ahead. The expansion of nuclear power may consume all U.S. uranium stocks in about 10 years, forcing the nation to develop a "breeder reactor", which uses a more plentiful form of uranium, but it will also require some technological refinements. A commercial demonstration plant by the mid-1980's is the target. Most scientists think the long-range answer to our energy needs is thermonuclear fusion, a process that could release inexhaustible amounts of clean energy through the combustion of hydrogen atoms to form heavier atoms of helium and without dangerous radioactivity. The technology of controlled fusion power is immensely complex, and scientific, economic and engineering barriers must be overcome.

Nuclear research should receive top priority by the federal government. It has developed at a slower pace than originally planned, and the rate of use should rise sharply in coming years.

SOLAR ENERGY

Long underrated as a source of energy, solar energy is attracting more attention. Utilization of this source is almost nonexistent. Since solar energy is thinly distributed and intermittent, with night and overcast skies often prevailing, its efficient collection and storage present difficult technological problems. Although costs are likely to be high, solar energy is clean, renewable and abundant, and these qualities provide a strong incentive to develop it, especially for heating and cooling buildings, which now consumes more than 20% of our total energy requirements. Present funding for solar energy is minimal and should be increased.

GEOTHERMAL ENERGY

Already geothermal energy is being tapped, accounting for about .1 percent of our present electric power capacity. The heat accumulated for ages in the earth's interior is probably limitless, and it comes as steam, hot water and hot rocks. Very little effort is now going into geothermal energy sources, but it is sufficiently promising that greater efforts are required.

COAL

Coal is the most abundant fossil fuel in the nation and supplies 18% of our total energy use today. The reserves are ample for the foreseeable future, but extracting it from the earth by strip-mining or deep mining can be unsafe and unhealthy, and burning it pollutes the air. Nevertheless, coal is a promising fuel for the future. Converting it to gas (coal gasification) or to liquid (coal liquification) is appealing because of declining natural gas and oil supplies. Pilot plants for coal gasification are in operation and commercial plants are expected by 1985. The government is appropriately stepping up its coal research programs. By 1990, coal could be supplying significant amounts of gas and oil if enough capital is forthcoming, ample water for the manufacturing process is available, and the safety and environmental problems of extracting the coal are solved.

Other sources of energy, like winds, tides and artificially produced hydrogen, may also help supply our energy needs in the future.

Until these alternative sources of energy fulfill their promise, the U.S. must rely on more conventional fuels and confront the problems they entail. The energy shortage today arises because we failed to plan adequately yesterday. Today we must plan to assure sufficient energy for tomorrow, and these far-out and far-off solutions demand attention and development.

HEADSTART FEE SCHEDULE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks considerable concern has been expressed by individuals throughout the country regarding the fee schedule required for Headstart programs. Questions have also been raised by Members of Congress as well as the Office of Child Development regarding its necessity and effectiveness. Since the Headstart program has always enjoyed bipartisan support and because there is insufficient evidence available at this time to determine the actual impact of the schedule, I, along with Congressmen PERKINS, QUIE, HAWKINS, BELL, and BRADEMAS, have introduced legislation today to defer its implementation until July 1, 1975. In this way I believe that the Congress, working with the administration, can carefully evaluate the entire situation and develop the most effective avenue to follow in resolving the matter. In addition to the legislation, a letter has been sent to Caspar Weinberger, Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, informing him of our actions. I am inserting at this point in the RECORD a copy of the letter so that my colleagues can better understand the problem:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., November 13, 1973.
The Honorable CASPAR W. WEINBERGER,
Secretary Department of Health, Education,
and Welfare, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In recent weeks, substantial questions have been raised concerning implementation of the Fee Schedule for the Head Start program. As you are aware, the concept of a fee schedule was originally developed as part of the Child Development bill in 1971, in order to open that legislation to children from all economic backgrounds.

That bill was added to the EOA legislation which was eventually vetoed by the President. After the veto, as the Congress was reconsidering the total bill, the Child Development section was deleted and the fee schedule was made part of the Head Start program.

Preliminary evidence indicates that the fee schedule is forcing the non-poor to drop out because they won't pay the fee. Inclusion of the non-poor in the program is now dependent on the willingness of parents to pay, not on the need of the child. This could destroy continuity for a child who starts the program but is forced to drop out because of family income increases. The focus of Head Start is thereby changed considerably from its original intent. There is an indication that there has also been an increase in administrative problems with the introduction of the fee schedule and it appears that some local Head Start programs are refusing to collect the fees at all. We understand that in other cases it has caused friction between the poor and the near poor and that the costs of collecting the fees are actually greater than the fees being collected. Furthermore, we have been advised that the Office of Management and Budget indicates that there is insufficient statistical evidence at present to determine what impact the imposition of the fees will have

on existing Head Start programs and the participation in them.

Although we have not reached any specific conclusions on this matter, it is our feeling that an effective evaluation of this proposal's impact is necessary before a reasoned judgment on the merits of the fee schedule can be made. Today Members of the Education and Labor Committee will introduce legislation postponing the implementation of the Head Start fee schedule until a total evaluation can be made by the Congress, working with the Administration, to determine the actual impact.

Thank you for your serious consideration of this matter.

Sincerely,

CARL D. PERKINS,
JOHN BRADEMAMAS,
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS,
ALBERT H. QUIE,
ALPHONZO BELL,
WILLIAM A. STEIGER.

DEENERGIZED CHRISTMAS PLANNED FOR CONNECTICUT TOWN

HON. RONALD A. SARASIN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. SARASIN. Mr. Speaker, with the Christmas holiday season almost underway, we expect to see the usual array of glittering shop windows, evergreens laden with twinkling lights, city streets ablaze with neon signs flashing Noel and loud speakers blaring our contorted versions of "Jingle Bells" and "Silent Night" while eager shoppers scurry from store to store in preparation for the festivities.

All of us are familiar with this scene, and none of us wants to eliminate totally the artifacts of the Christmas season, despite our usual complaints about "commercialized Christmas." However, this season may not be quite as enticing as most, particularly as we discover that roasting chestnuts before an open fire is great sport once in awhile, but no way to prepare dinner every night, and that a one horse open sleigh is not the best means of travel on the New Jersey Turnpike, the price of hay being what it is these days.

What Americans termed the "energy challenge" this summer has now become the "energy crisis" and each and every one of us will be affected by it, if we have not already. At this time we need not conjure up visions of a paralyzed Nation, but we do need to look realistically at our energy needs in relation to our current supplies and readily available sources. The President recently outlined his proposals for coping with this situation, and I am hopeful Congress will act as soon as possible in putting much-needed controls into effect.

I would like to offer my praise to the Chamber of Commerce of Naugatuck, Conn., which has already taken steps to curb energy usage in that city, while at the same time encouraging others to follow suit. I would like to share a news release which presents the Christmas decorations policy of the Naugatuck Chamber of Commerce. It reads as follows:

James N. Greene, Jr., Executive Vice President of the Naugatuck Chamber of Commerce, Naugatuck, Connecticut, announced

for the Board of Directors and the Retail Division of the Chamber, that because of the mounting, urgent energy crisis that has become severe to the New England area, the Christmas decorations usually displayed in Naugatuck, under the direction of the Naugatuck Chamber of Commerce, will be displayed; however, NOT energized.

Michael Julianelle, Advertising Manager for the Naugatuck Daily News and Chairman of this effort, stated that any Christmas decorations the Naugatuck Chamber of Commerce oversees will be day-time decorations only.

The Chamber Directors and the Retail Division believe that this action is one step in the right direction and in the best interests of all concerned and involved, concluded Julianelle.

I believe this decision warrants the approval and praise of all Americans as this is a demonstration of willingness to cooperate in utilizing our energy supplies most efficiently.

AN EFFICIENT CHARITY

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, as some of our colleagues know, I am drafting legislation to require financial disclosure by charities and other organizations that use the mails to solicit funds.

I am prompted by evidence that 80 percent or more of the money collected in some charitable drives is siphoned off to pay various "overhead" costs.

Often, these extra expenses include the services of professional fund raisers whose commissions can deplete the proceeds of even the most successful drive.

I believe people should be able to donate to any cause, no matter how dubious or how badly run. But by the same token, prospective contributors should be given some inkling where their money would go, and that is the purpose of the bill I am preparing.

Basically, the legislation would require soliciting agencies to include on their letterhead or other appropriate location a breakdown of how the sums collected were being disbursed. In addition, charities would be required to make available their financial records on request.

There are of course many charities that do not have to be told to level with the public.

One fine example is in my home community—the San Diego Chapter of the Diabetes Association of Southern California.

Costs of the annual fund-raising effort by this group last year came to only 10.2 percent of receipts, and the books are open to anyone who wants to see them.

The secret of success is found in the adroit and extensive use of volunteers, plus a yearly bike-a-thon that is the principle fund-raising device. Bicyclists obtain pledges of support in advance of the ride, and are also responsible for making collections and mailing them to the association's headquarters.

The most recent bike-a-thon was held this past Sunday, over two courses in the San Diego area. Some 1,300 riders participated, and one young sailor from

the guided-missile frigate *Halsey* raised an astonishing \$381. All told, proceeds are expected to exceed \$20,000, with nine-tenths of that going for actual help to diabetics and their families.

An account of the weekend ride, from Monday's San Diego Union, follows:

DIABETES BIKE-A-THON DRAWS 1,300 CYCLISTS
(By Gina Lubrano)

Guillermo Bejarano pulled off the road yesterday because the passenger strapped to his bike during the Diabetes Bike-A-Thon kept dropping off—to sleep.

His passenger was Guillermo Bejarano Jr., 1½, and when it was time for his nap, he took it. He could see the sights around Mission Bay when he wasn't so sleepy.

Bejarano, and another son, Steven, 8, waited a half hour for the toddler to drink his bottle and sleep before continuing on the 20-mile route.

The Bejaranos, of 4077 Marlborough Way in East San Diego, rode in the bike-a-thon because Steven is a diabetic, Bejarano said. The \$50 they will collect from sponsors for the ride will go for research being conducted in San Diego by the Diabetes Association of Southern California, a spokesman said.

TWO SEPARATE ROUTES

About 1,300 persons participated in the ride over two routes, a spokesman said. The 20-mile Mission Bay route took riders from Point Loma to Mission Bay Drive. The 17-mile El Cajon University route took riders from El Cajon Boulevard to La Mesa.

Jeff Campbell of Pacific Beach and Joanne Leirich of La Mesa rode tandem for the bike-a-thon. "This is a two-horsepower bike," Campbell joked.

"How much further do we have to go?" asked Janice Hill, 10, of 2403 E. Ingersoll St. Linda Vista. She groaned when she heard the answer, but said she was riding in the bike-a-thon "cause I want to."

Some of the riders went over the route more than once. One man spun his way along the El Cajon Boulevard route at least four times, a spokesman said.

AVERAGED \$19 EACH

Each participant had obtained a sponsor or a number of sponsors prior to the ride. The Campbell-Leirich team had arranged to collect 50 cents a mile for their efforts.

Janice said her sponsors were going to give her 35 cents a mile.

The first bike-a-thon for the Diabetes Association of Southern California was last year. The average earning of each rider during the first one was \$19, a spokesman said.

Yesterday, Steven Bejarano attached a green flag to his bike that had been provided by the Diabetes Association.

money orders in the District of Columbia. There is a very special need for this legislation in that the District of Columbia has no law whatsoever in this area. This has manifested itself by the many fly-by-night private check and money order companies now operating here. These same companies operate only in States and the District of Columbia where no law exists for licensing or bonding, accumulating a fast-growing clientele holding worthless checks and money orders which have bounced as the result of fraudulent operations or financial insolvency. Particularly hard hit are those people who use the private check or money order business as a primary means to pay household bills, and can least afford to find their payments due still outstanding when the check or money order bounces and their money gone. These people deserve the protection and security derived from a workable, fair, and inexpensive bonding and licensing arrangement.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will establish the requirement that any person issuing checks or money orders in the District of Columbia, post a bond of \$50,000, with an additional principal sum of \$5,000 for each location in excess of one. Licensing of each applicant under this bill will be made in writing and under oath to the Superintendent of Insurance of the District of Columbia in such form as he may prescribe. Upon filing of an application, the Superintendent shall ascertain whether the applicant satisfies the necessary qualifications prescribed by this bill, and if so found qualified, the Superintendent will issue to the applicant a license to engage in the business of selling checks and money orders in the District of Columbia. The Superintendent may invoke a license on any ground on which he may refuse to grant a license or for violation of any provision contained in this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the crucial factor here is to assure the value of a check or money order once the consumer has put up his hard-earned cash for it. To this end, the bill I have introduced today would provide a new measure of security and a long overdue protection of the financial resources of users of the private check and money order system. I believe this is an important bill and urge enactment at the earliest possible date.

the rescuer. With these thoughts in mind and with the hope that in a small measure we can honor her by this public recognition I place on the RECORD a story from the White Bear Advisor concerning "a miracle" brought about by Miss Karen Korfhage:

"A MIRACLE," MOTHER SAYS OF RESCUE

Mrs. Raymond Shields calls it a miracle. Karen Korfhage, 20, thinks of it as the most important part of her job.

Karen is credited with saving the life of Ken Shields, 16, of 130-6th St.

In spite of the fact that Kenneth outweighs her by 75 pounds and is five inches taller, the 110-pound Ramsey county beach lifeguard lifted him off the bottom of the lake. She and fellow lifeguards restored the boy's breathing in 45 seconds.

Ken was hospitalized for two days, but his mother said he was fit this week. The near-drowning took place several weeks ago.

Kenneth and a friend, John Kurkowski, Vadnais Heights, went to the beach one afternoon. Kenneth was dressed in jeans and had no intention of going into the water. But the lake looked inviting and he waded out. He was warned by Karen not to go in because beach regulations prohibit swimming without a swimming suit.

Ken, whose mother said he was "not a good swimmer," was nearly to the diving deck when he was told to go back to shore. As he started back, his jeans filled with water and dragged him down. Kurkowski came to his aid, attempting to hold him up but lost his grip and Ken slipped below the surface. John yelled for help. Karen made an attempt to find him, but could not. Then, according to Mrs. Shields, the "miracle happened when the sun came out." The clouds parted and the sun came out and this allowed Karen to see Ken. On her second attempt she was able to see Kenneth on the bottom.

She pulled him to the surface. Another lifeguard, Dave Reif, helped her get him to the deck where Reif administered mouth-to-mouth resuscitation. Karen massaged his heart. Two Ramsey county sheriff's deputies arrived and rushed Ken to St. Paul-Ramsey hospital. He was in intensive care for two days.

Karen said she was not afraid until she saw how big Ken was when he was out of the water. She is a pre-medical student at the University of Minnesota and hopes to be a doctor. She was a lifeguard at Memorial Beach for two years before transferring to Ramsey county beach this year.

She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. M. C. (Bud) Korfhage.

Mrs. Shields said last week that she thinks it was a miracle, but she was grateful to everyone who helped save her boy's life. She included his friend, the lifeguards and the sheriff's deputies.

She warned against wearing jeans for swimming and recommended the buddy system for all swimmers.

A BILL TO PROVIDE FOR THE LICENSING BY THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OF THE BUSINESS OF SELLING, ISSUING, OR DELIVERING CHECKS, DRAFTS, AND MONEY ORDERS AS A SERVICE OR FOR A FEE OR OTHER CONSIDERATIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill today which will provide consumer protection to those persons who purchase private checks or

A MIRACLE OF A RESCUE

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker. In this day of seemingly continual crisis it is a good idea to pause and reflect upon some of the good things about our country. This pause was suggested by a story I read recently of a young woman's great personal courage in saving a young man's life. While she did not think anything of it because it was simply a part of her job as a lifeguard, it is significant to note that the person saved was some five inches taller and 75 pounds heavier than

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, on November 18, the Latvian people, including Americans of Latvian origin, observe the 55th Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. The importance of this occasion is that the hope of freedom of the people of Latvia remain strong despite years of oppression.

Latvia is truly a captive nation and the people of Latvia are dedicated to the restoration of the liberty that is rightfully theirs under any interpretation of basic international human rights. The victory of Stalin burns in their minds as a clear act of aggression, which will one day be avenged. The American people can understand that kind of hope and we must support and rekindle the hope for freedom wherever it exists under the yoke of tyranny.

In this era of détente, the United States must not forget the people of Latvia and the other captive nations. We will remember them, I am confident, because it is the right thing to do. The expression of concern by Members of the House on this issue is evident as we join in this observance of the 55th anniversary of the declaration of independence of Latvia.

CFR: NEW MEMBERSHIP 1973

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the Council on Foreign Relations has voluntarily supplied me with its Annual Report for 1972-73.

The 141 men and women who became members of the council during the period of the report are as follows:

David M. Abshire, George H. Aldrich, Joe J. Allbritton, John B. Anderson, Les Aspin, *M. Genevieve Atwood, Josiah Lee Auspitz, Perry O. Barber, Jr., David O. Belm, Lloyd M. Bentsen, Jr.

Bernard R. Berelson, Marilyn Berger, Suzanne Berger, Eugene A. Birnbaum, *Andrew H. Blauvelt, Frederick M. Bohen, John Brademas, Lewis M. Branscomb, Alfred Brittain III, Edward W. Brooke.

José A. Cabranes, Joseph A. Califano, Jr., John Carey, Charles W. Carson, Jr., Frank T. Cary, William J. Casey, Henry E. Catto, Jr., John Chancellor, George A. Chandler, Robert G. Chollar.

Warren Christopher, Ray S. Cline, Barber B. Conable, Jr., Joseph F. Condon, John T. Connor, Jr., John C. Culver, William M. Dietel, Stephen H. DuBrul, Jr., Freeman J. Dyson, *Jessica P. Einhorn.

*Robert J. Elmhorn, Donald H. Elliott, Dante B. Fascell, Clarence Clyde Ferguson, Jr., Frances FitzGerald, Murray H. Finley, Donald T. Fox, Donald M. Fraser, Alton Frye, Paul M. Fye.

Leslie H. Gelb, *Patrick A. Gerschel, Henry R. Geyelin, Philip L. Geyelin, Eli Goldston, Alexander M. Haig, Jr., *David R. Halperin, Robert L. Heilbroner, Richard M. Helms, *John A. Herfort.

Frank W. Hoch, Jerome H. Holland, Graham Hovey, John Hughes, Fred C. Iklé, Norman Jacobs, *Robbin S. Johnson, W. Thomas Johnson, Jr., Willard R. Johnson, Marvin L. Kalb.

Alfred Orr Kelly, *William J. Kilberg, Lane Kirkland, Curtis M. Kjaerner, John H. Knowles, Edward A. Kolodziej, Lawrence B. Krause, Kermit I. Lansner, Ivo J. Lederer, Monroe Leigh.

*Hillel Levine, Charles Edwin Lord, Winston Lord, James T. Lynn, Laurence E. Lynn, Jr., Harry C. McPherson, Jr., William B. Macomber, Jr., Walter F. Mondale, Richard M. Moose, Thomas E. Morgan.

Edward L. Morse, *Kenneth P. Morse, Ed-

*Indicates Term Member.

mund S. Muskie, Andre W. G. Newburg, John Newhouse, Matthew Nimetz, Michel Oksenberg, James J. O'Leary, *Kathryn C. Pelgrift, Lionel I. Pincus.

Walter H. Pincus, Myer Rashish, Donald T. Regan, Nicholas Rey, John B. Rhineland, John B. Rhodes, Jr., Emmett Rice, Richard W. Richardson.

Chalmers M. Roberts, Charles W. Robinson, James D. Robinson III, David E. Rogers, Frederick P. Rose, William V. Roth, Jr., Nadav Safran, John A. Scall, *Jan Schneider, Robert C. Seamans, Jr., Eli Shapiro.

Herbert M. Shayne, Eleanor Bernert Sheldon, George L. Sherry, Leonard S. Silk, Ann B. Sloane, Walter B. Slocumbe, Gaddis Smith, Louis B. Sohn, Robert Solomon, Charles R. Stevens, Seth P. Tillman.

Russell E. Train, H. Anton Tucher, Edward Hallam Tuck, Stansfield Turner, Charles H. Weaver, Nils Y. Wessell, Marina von Neumann Whitman, Leonard Woodcock, Jerry Wurf, *Daniel Yergin, *Stephen B. Young.

As of August 31, 1973, the Council had 1,551 members, an increase of 75 over the number as of August 31, 1972. Of these members, 662 are resident members, 357 are in the Boston and Washington areas, and 532 are in other parts of the United States and overseas.

The professional distribution of the present membership is:

Profession	Number of Members
Scholars or academic administrators	373
Business executives	468
U.S. Government officials	195
Lawyers	127
Journalists, correspondents and communications executives	135
Administrators of non-profit institutions	187
Other	66

GOVERNMENT CONTROLS BRING SHORTAGES

HON. ROBERT J. HUBER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, Industry Week succinctly portrays a principal reason for the current rash of shortages in our Nation—shortages which range from fertilizer to metals and paper—as the overabundance of Government controls.

I recommend for the attention of my colleagues Mr. Walter J. Campbell's short editorial of October 22 reprinted below:

TIGHTEN YOUR BELTS

We were more than a little surprised after four months in retirement to receive three telephone calls this week from friends in the metalworking business asking where they could obtain steel.

We didn't know. We figured the situation must be rather desperate when these steel-hungry manufacturers turned to us for information. All we could say was that the mills we knew were sold out for the year and that their order books had been closed for some weeks. That, of course, was neither news nor help.

Scarcities and shortages have become a way of life in this country.

We not only are short of steel, but we are also short of aluminum and copper. Paper is scarce. Plastics are in short supply. Brick, lumber, roofing, plumbing supplies, and other building materials often are unavailable, and builders and their home-building customers wait and wait and wait—and then pay through the nose.

Farmers have been advised that fertilizers will be in short supply next season—and that probably will aggravate the food shortages.

We have shortages in practically everything—except government controls.

Controls are a prime cause of the shortages and the lack of capacity expansion from which the shortages spring. That should surprise no one.

Price controls over the past several years have held profit margins down.

Meanwhile, the cost of expanding has shot upwards.

The cost of borrowing money rose to a point where manufacturers would be silly to finance new capacity on borrowed funds.

The securities market got sick and made the raising of new capital through new stock issues unfeasible.

So, we have failed to expand capacity to meet today's needs.

And, on top of that, a substantial number of production facilities have been abandoned, or will be abandoned, because they cannot be brought up to environmental standards economically.

Shortages inevitably raise prices—controls or no controls.

We have shortages of capacity.

We have shortages of materials.

We will continue to live with shortages until the control-minded bureaucrats take their cotton-pickin' fingers off the economic mechanism and permit market forces to regulate the supply and demand of goods.

PROGRESSIVE MAGAZINE CALLS FOR IMPEACHMENT OF THE PRESIDENT

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, in its forthcoming December 1973 issue, the prestigious journal, the Progressive, whose offices are located in my congressional district, will present a 10-article bill of impeachment calling for the removal of the President.

The impeachment question is now before the House Judiciary Committee, and the Progressive is to be congratulated for reminding us of our obligation to move promptly to resolve this matter. I commend to all House Members and, in particular, to my colleagues on the Judiciary Committee, the editorial, "A Call to Action," by the Progressive editors:

A CALL TO ACTION

(By the Editors of the Progressive)

Crisis. The word has been overworked by all of us, and particularly by those engaged in reporting, analyzing, and interpreting the news. We have been recording monthly, weekly, daily crises for longer than we care to remember—foreign and domestic crises, military and political crises, economic, racial, and cultural crises. A headlined crisis no longer generates alarm, or even profound concern. Ho hum, another crisis. . . .

But the crisis that grips America today is of another, higher magnitude—one that deserves, perhaps, a new term that has not been eroded by abuse. It swirls, of course, around the person of the President of the United States, but it impinges on every facet of the national life and character. We are confronted, suddenly and dramatically, with fundamental questions about our national community—questions that demand swift and decisive answers.

Are we prepared, after almost 200 years, to abandon our experiment—intermittently successful but always hopeful—in enlightened self-government? Will we permit our highest and most powerful office—an office

whose occupant can literally decide the future and even the survival of the nation and the world—to remain in the hands of a man who has, in the words of the American Civil Liberties Union, "made one thing perfectly clear: He will function above the law whenever he can get away with it." Will we refrain, because of our timidity or sheer inertia, from availing ourselves of the remedies provided by the Constitution of the United States for precisely such an emergency?

Three years remain in Richard M. Nixon's second Presidential term—time enough for him to compound and render irreversible the catastrophic damage he has already done. It is understandable that the President may feel that if he can survive in office for those three years, he will have achieved a measure of vindication. But his vindication will be our indictment and conviction. If we, the American people, knowing what we now know about this President and his Administration, permit him to serve out his term, we will stand condemned in history for the grave offense of murdering the American dream.

These pages go to press amidst a chorus of demands for Mr. Nixon's resignation. The demands emanate not only from Mr. Nixon's long-standing critics—his "enemies," as he would doubtless style them—but from many who were, until recently, among his most enthusiastic supporters. The editors of *Time*, in the first editorial of the magazine's fifty-year history—at least the first so labeled—called on him to "give up the Presidency rather than do further damage to the country." The same suggestion has been advanced by newspapers which, only a little more than a year ago, were unreservedly advocating his re-election and which, only months ago, were minimizing the gravity of the Watergate disclosures; by Republican politicians who fear, not without justification, that the President is now an intolerable burden to their party; by businessmen who no longer can vest their confidence in Mr. Nixon as the chosen instrument of corporate prosperity.

Mr. Nixon would derive some obvious benefits if he were to heed this advice and relinquish his office. Unlike his recently departed Vice President, Spiro T. Agnew, he would not have to couple his resignation with a guilty plea to any crime. Like Mr. Agnew, he could continue to proclaim his innocence—and to denounce his "enemies"—in perpetuity. He has always relished the role of victim, and he could carry it to oblivion.

At the same time, the Congress would be spared from exercising a responsibility which it clearly does not welcome—the responsibility of impeaching the President of the United States. And the American people, the people who only a year ago gave the President an unprecedented mandate and whose disenchantment has now reached unprecedented depths, could breathe a deep sigh and go about the business of restoring a measure of order and hope to their national affairs.

But the decision to resign is, ultimately, the President's alone to make, and the word from the White House at this writing is that he will not be moved (or removed). He has "no intention whatever of walking away from the job I was elected to do," he told the nation on November 7.

It is our judgment, and we believe it is the American people's judgment, that the job he has done is enough.

Until and unless the President changes his mind about resigning, the decision to resolve the crisis that grips the nation will be ours to make—for only by exerting immense and unremitting pressure can we convince the Congress that it must discharge its constitutional responsibility. Public opinion, has already persuaded some legislators to abandon their customary vacillating stance. Public opinion, forcefully applied, can move the requisite number of Representa-

tives to embark on the process of impeachment.

The first order of business confronting Congress is to fill the vacancy in the Vice Presidency. Mr. Nixon's designee, Representative Gerald R. Ford of Michigan, would hardly be our first (or thousandth) choice; he is, in our view, unsuited intellectually and politically to hold the nation's highest office. But given the choice—and it is the choice we are given—between mediocrity (Mr. Ford) and moral disgrace (Mr. Nixon), we have no difficulty choosing the former. America has muddled through with mediocre leadership before, but it cannot go on much longer with leadership that is morally bankrupt.

Once a Vice President has been installed, the "engine of impeachment"—James Madison's term—can be set in motion. It is an engine that the leaders of the House and Senate clearly would prefer not to start, but it can be ignited by any member of the House of Representatives who chooses to take the floor and declare: "Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of constitutional privilege. . . . I impeach Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, for high crimes and misdemeanors." Citing only the facts that have already come to light, that have for the most part been verified, this member of the House can invite his colleagues to do their constitutional duty by considering the charges against the President.

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, November 18 marks the 55th anniversary of Latvia's declaration of independence. The rights and joys of a free society in Latvia were brief, since in 1940, 22 years after the Latvian's fought to free their land from invading countries, Latvia fell to the Russian army. Latvia has been a captive nation since 1940 and its people have been deprived of their individual and collective rights and freedoms while under Soviet domination. As a supporter of freedom for the Baltic people and all other captive nations, I would like to ask that Congress take time to remember these people in their fight for freedom and human rights. The fate of these captive nations should not be forgotten because their future outlines the future of Europe and the world balance for years to come.

I am including a letter by Dr. Ilgvars Spilners, president of the American Latvian Association in the United States, Inc. which merits the attention of all Members:

LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE DAY

Latvia was established as an independent nation on November 18, 1918. It took almost two more years for the newly created Latvian Army to defeat the invading Russian and German troops and liberate the whole country. The hostilities ended with a Peace Treaty of 1920 between Latvia and Russia. With this treaty, Russia unreservedly recognized the independence, self-subsistency, and sovereignty of the Latvian State and voluntarily and forever renounced all sovereign rights over the Latvian people and territory, which formerly belonged to Russia. Republic of Latvia was recognized as a sover-

eign State by all major countries, and was a member of the League of Nations.

The end of Latvian independence came on June 17, 1940, when the Russian Red Army invaded the country and started annexation of Latvia to the Soviet Union.

Numerous world political and intellectual leaders have publically declared their support for Latvian, as well as Lithuanian and Estonian freedom, self-determination, and human rights. They admit, however, that Russians, governed by the present dictatorship, and practicing an expansionist policy, are not going to leave Latvia, or the other two Baltic States, voluntarily, and are militarily too powerful to be forced to leave. If there is to be more than just talk, the Baltic question should be raised in the broader context of equal rights and self-determination of people and the respect for human rights as fundamental freedom before the respective committees of the Conference on Security and Cooperation in Europe, now meeting in Geneva. This Baltic question should be discussed even if the Russians object. Hopefully, these discussions would be educational and would eventually change the Russian attitude toward the Baltic States.

OUR NATION SALUTES THE STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA, JOHANN VON KALB, NO. 46 OF HALEDON, N.J., ON ITS 50TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, October 13, 1973, it was my privilege and honor to join with members of my congressional district and State of New Jersey in celebrating the 50th golden anniversary of Johann Von Kalb Unit No. 46, the Steuben Society of America. The outstanding contributions of those of our citizens of German-American heritage in the fields of scientific innovation and cultural enrichment to our society were eloquently presented by the following members of the Steuben Society of America with whom I was honored to share the dais:

Edward J. Sussmann, national chairman of the Steuben Society of America; Frank J. Krutzky, chairman, Johann Von Kalb Unit; George Hartleb, chairman of the New Jersey State Council; Frieda Scheidewig, banquet chairman, and Dick Ahlers, master of ceremonies.

The eloquence of the presentation by national chairman Edward J. Sussman most poignantly reminded all of those assembled of the extraordinary contribution to the fight for freedom in establishing our democracy of Gen. Friedrich Wilhelm von Steuben. As you and our colleagues here in the House know, the Steuben Society of America was organized in honor of this great American Revolutionary War hero of German ancestry. In promulgating and preserving the richness of the cultures of our German heritage, this distinguished organization has matured in the vanguard of our historic preservation societies in the communion of America's citizenry who cherish the freedom and independence on which our Nation was founded.

In celebrating this golden jubilee, the dedication and devotion of the patron statesman, Gen. Johann Von Kalb, whose service to our country in the Continental Army under Gen. George Washington in the early years of America's struggle for independence had inspired the founding a half-century ago of the Johann Von Kalb Unit No. 46, was indeed mirrored in the spirit of those in attendance. The program that evening manifested a quality of life here in America that has prospered because of the freedom and justice that has been available to all who came to the shores of our great country seeking a better world for themselves and their children with the pride that all Americans have of their heritage.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully ask that you and our colleagues here in the Congress join with me now in extending our heartiest congratulations and best wishes to the members of the Steuben Society of America, Johann Von Kalb Unit No. 46, in commemorating this historic 50th anniversary with special commendation to the outstanding public service being rendered by its officers. The 1973 officers of the Johann Von Kalb Unit No. 46 are as follows:

Frank J. Krutzky, chairman; Kurt Heller, first vice chairman; Frieda Scheidewig, second vice chairman; Frank Reuter, third vice chairman; Ida Connolly, secretary; George Stromsdorfer, financial secretary; Fred Mayer, treasurer; Otto Ernst, first trustee; Gertrude Mayer, second trustee; Ida Connolly, delegate to State council, and Frieda Scheidewig, alternate delegate.

Mr. Speaker, the interest and involvement of our people is a most important integral part of our governmental process. Throughout the years the Steuben Society of America has addressed the Congress on the many issues confronting our Nation, which has proven to be a healthy exchange of views in the form of public opinion that is important to the promulgation of legislative proposals and action programs essential to meet the needs of our people.

To understand the present, we must understand the past. To meet the challenges of the future, we must ever maintain the communication arteries so important to the people's decisionmaking agencies of our Government. On the 50th anniversary observance of the Johann Von Kalb Unit No. 46, I believe it would be most appropriate to review, and I insert at this point in our historic journal of Congress, the aims and purposes upon which the Steuben Society of America was founded. Their official statement of purpose is as follows:

AIMS AND PURPOSES OF THE STEUBEN SOCIETY OF AMERICA

Loyally to support the Constitution of the United States of America by advocating the proper application of its provisions and inculcating the principles underlying true democratic government;

To quicken the spirit of sound Americanism; and to foster a patriotic American spirit among all citizens;

To aid in maintaining the independence and sovereignty of the United States of America and its freedom from all foreign influence;

To establish co-operation among its members in the exercise of their civic duties and

to encourage them in active participation in every phase of our national life;

To promote the welfare and enhance the happiness of its members and their fellow-men;

To perpetuate itself as a patriotic and fraternal voluntary membership organization and to provide for its government;

To guard our political liberty by maintaining an honest equality of citizenship regardless of birth, origin or religion of any citizen;

To maintain the traditions of our country.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation has been nourished and secured by the cultural standards of excellence that all nationalities have contributed to the quality of our way of life here in America and we can indeed share the great pride of all of our citizens in the outstanding achievements and contributions that the people of German heritage have made to America's preeminence among all nations of the world. I know you will want to join with me today in saluting the Steuben Society of America, Johann Von Kalb Unit No. 46 as it celebrates its golden anniversary of untiring dedication and devotion to the cause of freedom, justice and a good life for all in helping to preserve the endowment and traditions of our German heritage which have truly enriched our community, State, and Nation.

VETERANS' PENSIONS

HON. HAROLD V. FROELICH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. FROELICH. Mr. Speaker, a sequence of events evolved this afternoon which is nothing short of mind-boggling. I am shocked, amazed, and annoyed by what I consider to be, at best, a prostitution of the legislative process and, at worst, a deliberate attempt to exclude legitimate discussion and debate from passage of veterans' pension legislation.

On July 30, 1973, the House of Representatives passed legislation increasing veterans' pensions. This bill, H.R. 9474, did not contain an increase in the limitation on the income a veteran can earn without losing his pension. This provision I considered vital to any pension increase bill and I had introduced a bill to accomplish this purpose in the House as one of my first bills of my first Congress. I was very pleased, therefore, when the Senate, in veterans' pension increase legislation passed by that body in August, included a \$400 increase in the income limitation. While \$200 short of the amount in my bill, it was a more preferable alternative than the House-passed version, and I was hopeful that sufficient support could be mustered for this provision to retain it in the bill as it would eventually be sent to the President.

Since both Houses of Congress had passed different forms of the bill, I waited patiently for the bill to be sent to conference, at which time it was my intention to urge the conferees to retain the \$400 income limitation increase in the final bill. I was told, however, on a number of occasions, that the staffs of the House and Senate committees were trying to iron out the differences in the two

bills themselves, thus eliminating the need for a time-consuming conference. I began to question which procedure was more time-consuming as the summer became fall and it appeared that we were in the last few months of the session, but still no announcement came.

As of this morning, the schedule for the House floor today was House Resolution 128, dealing with Members convicted of certain crimes and H.R. 11333, Social Security Act amendments. When the House went into session, I had not been notified in any way that the schedule had been changed. Shortly after 12, I left the House floor to meet with a group of constituents. When I returned, in less than an hour, veterans legislation on which a compromise had suddenly been reached, had been called up, discussed, and passed by voice vote. A bill that had lain dormant for 15 weeks had taken less than 15 minutes to clear the House. There were many questioning looks on the floor and my questions as to what the bill contained could not be answered by many of the people I approached. After much searching I found that the bill did not contain an increase in the income limitation, a fact which deeply disturbs me.

I am more deeply disturbed, however, by the procedure or, rather, the lack thereof, by which the bill was considered. If they can in any way be construed to typify the legislative process, then perhaps the prophets of doom who decry our system and our institutions are closer to the truth than any of us should ever want to believe.

THE A-7D AIRPLANE

HON. DALE MILFORD

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. MILFORD. Mr. Speaker, I have flown the A-7D airplane and know it is a proud and capable ship. The fighter craft is built in my district, and those people are proud of its ability. But today I received an article written by the men who have flown combat missions in the LTV plane, and would like to share their opinions with my colleagues.

The article follows:

THE A-7D IN SEA

Gentlemen: We were extremely proud to read Mr. John L. Frisbee's article, "How the A-7D Rewrote the Book in SEA," in your August '73 issue of Air Force Magazine. All of us, presently deployed, believe your account to be tremendously accurate and an excellent depiction of our operations over here, at Korat. It is most rewarding to read journalistic work of such high quality, especially when it concerns the Air Force A-7D.

Although the A-7D was only in combat for ten months, the unparalleled accuracy and versatility demonstrated in high, medium, and low threat environments have given tactical airpower a greatly expanded capability. As of 15 August 1973, the Hummer has flown over 10,000 combat sorties in SEA. AF A-7Ds flew from Hanoi and Thai Nguyen in North Vietnam to the Mekong Delta in the South and from Kampot on the Cambodia coast to the Plain of Jars in Laos. No other aircraft has proven itself capable of such tactical flexibility in such a short time frame.

There is one more chapter we desire to add to the short history of SLUF. That chapter deals with the deep satisfaction we sustained when it was learned the A-7D was the last combat strike sortie to depart the Cambodian airspace on 15 August 1973. "Slam" flight, composed of aircraft 70-930 and 70-345, piloted by Maj. John H. Hoskins and Capt. Lonnie O. Ratley, III, will go down in our unit history as marking the end of our involvement in America's longest war.

The Tactical Air Command personnel supporting the 354th TFW deployed are unanimous in their hope that our participation has aided in creating an atmosphere conducive to peace and stability in the decades to come. We stand ready to react any time, anywhere, to threats against the peace and security of the free world.

The Officers, NCOs, and Airmen of the 354th Tactical Fighter Wing; 355th Tactical Fighter Wing; 23d Tactical Fighter Wing; and 3d Tactical Fighter Squadron, 388th Tactical Fighter Wing APO San Francisco.

EDUCATIONAL GRANTS FROM FOREIGN SOURCES

HON. BILL GUNTER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. GUNTER. Mr. Speaker, recently I noticed several newspaper stories announcing grants from foreign sources to our Nation's leading educational institutions. I call these articles to my colleagues' attention and invite them to join me in inquiring as to what other foreign funds have been given to our colleges and universities and not reported.

I believe that this question must be answered and I will attempt to provide such an answer in the days ahead.

The articles follow:

[From the New York Times, June 21, 1973]
JAPAN'S SUMITOMO GROUP GIVES \$2 MILLION TO YALE

(By Iver Peterson)

Japan's giant Sumitomo Group of banking, mining and manufacturing interests has given \$2-million to Yale University and \$1-million to the Japan Society here to promote Japanese-American cultural understanding.

The gifts from the Japanese conglomerate follow the gift of \$1-million to the Harvard University Law School from Mitsubishi Heavy Industries, one of the Sumitomo Group's rivals, last September.

The Sumitomo gift to Yale is the largest ever received by the university from a benefactor outside the country. Officials of universities and foundations are hoping that other Japanese corporations, including the Mitsui Company, Japan's largest business house, will join the trend established by the recent gifts.

Hosaka Hyuga, president of Sumitomo Metal Industries, Ltd., presented the \$1-million Japan Society gift to John D. Rockefeller 3d, chairman of the society's board of directors, at the organization's annual dinner last Monday.

The gift to Yale will be announced tomorrow in New Haven by Kingman Brewster Jr., the university's president, and Koji Asai, who recently retired as president of Sumitomo Bank.

Both gifts will be made in installments over five years. Yale will use its money to finance Japanese studies. The Japan Society will give all of its gift away as grants to col-

leges and universities, study groups and other bodies engaged in Japanese studies.

An official of the Japan Society who did not wish to be identified said yesterday that there was hope that the Sumitomo gift "could be, ah, refreshed, at the end five years, if the program is a success."

In an interview in his suite at the Carlyle Hotel yesterday, Mr. Asai said he hoped the gifts would promote friendly relations between the two countries, especially in light of recent friction over economic and trade issues.

Mr. Asai, who started with Sumitomo Bank as a disbursements ledger clerk 48 years ago—"and that was before we had computers," he laughed—dismissed a suggestion that his group was competing in a generosity contest with Mitsubishi.

"But perhaps our gift will stimulate other contributions," he added with a smile.

Japanese correspondents in New York were amused by Mr. Asai's reticence.

"The Zaibatsu compete in all things," one correspondent said, using the Japanese term for the giant family-controlled corporations that ostensibly were broken up after World War II, but that have nonetheless reconstituted themselves as large families of companies. Mitsui Sumitomo and Mitsubishi are the largest.

Mitsubishi's \$1-million gift to Harvard last September was widely reported with big headlines in Japan. The Japanese Ministry of Education said in a statement at the time that the gift represented a Japanese business effort to "change the [Japanese] image from that of an economic animal to that of a cultural animal" according to an unofficial translation.

The Japanese even coined a phrase for the Mitsubishi gift to Harvard. It translates as "Japanese version of the Fulbright grant."

POST-WORLD WAR II TREND

Before the recent gifts, Japanese corporations had no tradition of contributing to outside institutions, although Mr. Asai said the Sumitomo Group had aided the Japan Society before World War II. But with economic tensions growing between the two countries, and as Japanese officials complain that American policymakers fail to understand their country's position in world affairs, a new interest has arisen in promoting friendly relations.

"The attitude there," Rodney Armstrong, executive director of the Japan Society, said yesterday, "is that in the wake of these misunderstandings, they thought, 'If the Americans don't understand us any better than that we ought to sponsor some studies so we can understand each other better!'"

For Mr. Hyuga, the Sumitomo Metal Industries president, the gift to the Japan Society was also a personal one. At the presentation, he told of studying in a library built by the Rockefellers at the University of Tokyo in the 1920's while the university lay in ruins after an earthquake.

He said he was pleased to present the gift "to the son of our benefactor."

[From the Washington Post, July 27, 1973]

JAPAN PLANS AID TO U.S. UNIVERSITIES

(By Don Oberdorfer)

Washington Post Foreign Service

TOKYO, July 26.—Not so many years after his country was receiving handouts from the United States, a Japanese prime minister will fly to Washington with a pledge of \$10 million in his kit bag for foreign assistance to American universities.

The Japanese government's plan, as reported by reliable sources here today, is to announce its largesse for the U.S. schools during Premier Kakuei Tanaka's visit to Washington next week for summit talks with President Nixon.

According to present planning—subject to final bureaucratic review in characteristic Tokyo fashion—the money will be funnelled

through the government's Japan Foundation to help selected schools support and expand their Japanese studies programs.

The recently-announced gift to American universities by West Germany, another nation defeated by the United States in World War II, helped the Japanese to action. The German gift, \$45 million over more than 10 years, is larger in sum but smaller in its immediate impact than Japan's planned one-year benefaction.

POSSIBLE RECIPIENTS

More than 100 American Universities are reported to be equipped with educational programs of some sort on Japan, but most of the money will probably go to a few schools which have been the leaders in the field. The prominent ones are said to include Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia, Stanford and the Universities of Michigan, and Washington.

According to governmental sources here, no decision has yet been made on how the money will be apportioned. That delicate task will probably be left unfinished until Premier Tanaka has left the United States, lest an embarrassing and perhaps unseemly scramble for the funds complicate his visit.

In recent weeks, Harvard and Columbia have sent missions here to solicit money from the increasingly affluent Japanese. Former U.S. Ambassador Edwin O. Reischauer, who was seeking up to \$15 million to finance Harvard's Japanese studies Institute, was reportedly equipped with detailed plans and glossy full-color brochures to lure government officials and industrialists.

A few months ago, Japanese business firms gave \$2 million to Yale and \$1 million to Harvard Law School.

WHY AMERICA?

Some criticism has been voiced here at the idea of large gifts from Japan to rich universities of the richest country on earth. The critics say the money would be more appropriately spent to aid the educational processes of the poor nations of Southeast Asia and other areas where Japan has important interests.

Those who conceived the aid-to-America plan, however, argue that bridging the "communications gap" with the United States is a high-priority objective. They are backed up by Japanese financed studies, by U.S. research firms, which say the money to American schools will be a public relations asset as well as an aid to increased U.S. understanding of this country.

The government has also been preparing for the policy discussions scheduled early next week with Mr. Nixon. Today, Premier Tanaka and Foreign Minister Masayoshi Ohira met to discuss their Indochina economic aid programs. U.S. presidential aide Henry Kissinger's proposal for a new Atlantic charter, energy and food issues and U.S.-Japan economic relations.

Japanese diplomats began meeting yesterday with North Vietnamese diplomats in Paris to discuss normalization of relations. The Indochina aid program—which is expected to be an important topic in the Nixon-Tanaka talks—is reported to be in an advanced stage of planning here. Ohira told a news conference today that the government will complete an outline of the plan after hearing American views on the topic next week.

[From the Washington Post, Aug. 8, 1973]

JAPAN LISTS U.S. SCHOOLS FOR GRANTS

TOKYO, August 7.—The government today selected 10 prominent American universities to receive \$1 million each in public funds to further Japanese studies in the United States.

The decision carries forward the pledge of \$10 million in educational aid announced by Premier Kakuei Tanaka during his trip to Washington last week.

The universities selected to receive the grants Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Columbia,

Michigan, Chicago, Stanford, California, Washington in Seattle and Hawaii. The foreign ministry announcement said the traditions, past achievements and present scope of Japanese studies had been taken into account in making the choice. The 10 universities are all members of the Inter-university Center for Japanese Language Studies in Tokyo.

Officials here said each university will be expected to establish an endowment fund and to use the proceeds for stimulating Japanese studies, perhaps through a professorship. The funds allocated today will have to be appropriated by the legislature. The new studies program is expected to begin in September 1974.

"MURDER BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL"—NO. 46

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, today 12 people will be killed by handguns in the United States. In Great Britain only one person is killed by a handgun every 7½ weeks. The reason for this cannot be stricter punishment for the crime. In Great Britain there is no capital punishment; in our country the death penalty has been reinstated in some States.

It seems to me that a more plausible reason for the lower handgun murder rate in Britain, would be the one offered by the British Home Secretary Robert Carr. He said:

There is clear evidence that the ready availability of guns leads to their use in crime.

The State of Massachusetts, has twice as many legally certified handguns as do England and Wales. The homicide rate is understandably higher.

I am asking the people who represent the citizens of our country to look at the figures of handgun murders; and then decide whether or not they can oppose gun control legislation and ignore the more than 9,000 people who will die by handgun next year.

At this time I would like to include Nathan Cobb's article from the August 12, Boston Globe, and another report of a handgun murder from the November 4, New York Times.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 4, 1973]

METROPOLITAN BRIEFS FROM THE POLICE BLOTTER

One man was shot and killed and another wounded in the attempted holdup of Club 83, 151 Lenox Avenue, near 118th Street. The police said the dead man, James Thomas, 43 years old, of 559 West 158th Street, was in the restaurant when two men wearing ski masks and brandishing pistols entered and announced a holdup. Mr. Thomas struggled with the gunmen and several shots were fired, one of which struck him in the head, killing him instantly. Another shot wounded Alexander Brown, 30, of 987 Union Avenue the Bronx, in the abdomen. The police said Mr. Brown was holding a .45-caliber revolver. He was taken in custody to Harlem Hospital, where he was listed in critical condition.

**[From the Boston Globe, Aug. 12, 1973]
BRITAIN'S HANDGUN CRIMES INFINITESIMAL
COMPARED WITH UNITED STATES
(By Nathan Cobb)**

LONDON.—The bobby straightened his dark cap and smiled easily at the American who had asked him the question.

"Handguns" he replied, trying to be polite. "Your government writes reports about them. Ours does something about them."

Indeed, while the National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals last week recommended a nationwide ban on handguns in the United States—at least the fourth such national crime commission to do so during the past six years—the British government is measuring public response to its laws in the world.

British officials are reluctant to claim they have solutions to American problems. But many shake their heads when comparing handgun statistics in the two countries:

In all of England and Wales, there are an estimated 57,000 legally certified handguns, less than one-half the number in Massachusetts alone.

There is estimated to be one handgun for every 114 British families. In the United States, there are between 30 and 40 million handguns—roughly one for every 1.4 families.

In 1971, the last year for which figures are available, seven persons were murdered with handguns in England and Wales, while 8991 were killed in the United States.

One person is murdered with a handgun in England and Wales every seven and one-half weeks; it happens in America every 58 minutes.

In London, with a population of nearly eight million people, there were only two handgun murders during all of last year. Boston, with a population one-twelfth as large, had 43 handgun slayings.

In England and Wales, there are 2500 registered firearms dealers, one for every 22,000 people. The United States has 150,000 federally licensed dealers, one for every 1350 persons.

"We haven't got a problem like America's because we don't have the number of guns you have," one Home Office spokesman explained last week.

"We have an occasional shotgun slaying, or a stabbing or two. We even have axe murders. But it's almost never pistols."

Nor are handguns frequently used in other types of crimes in Britain: only 203 of 7465 robberies in 1971, and 59 of 46,153 assaults. In the United States, annual figures in these categories run into the hundreds of thousands.

Quite simply, it is not nearly as easy to acquire a handgun in Britain—where even police are armed only in emergency situations—as it is in the United States.

Since 1920, it has been in Britain an offense to buy, possess, use or carry a pistol (or rifle) and its ammunition without a certificate from a police chief. If more than one gun is desired, a special variance must be approved by police. The certificate also specifies the amount of ammunition that may be purchased or owned.

There are currently 190,646 firearms certificates in England and Wales, the vast majority are held in rural areas. Government officials claim they do not know how many are for handguns, but an independent study by Colin Greenwood, chief inspector, West Yorkshire Constabulary, recently indicated that each certificate represents 1.34 firearms and that 22.4 percent of the certificates were for pistols. Using this formula, there are only about 57,000 legally held handguns in Great Britain.

Certain types of people such as (convicted persons or persons of unsound mind) are prohibited from acquiring certificates. But the

police may also refuse to certify any person "unfitted to be entrusted with a firearm," which gives them enough leeway to refuse virtually anyone for any reason.

The United States has no such system of controls. The 1968 Federal Gun Control Act primarily bans mail order sales of firearms as well as over-the-counter sales of handguns to out-of-state residents. It requires only a drivers' license as proof of residence and does not control quantities of ammunition at all.

The British system is similar to the Massachusetts gun control statute, passed in 1968, which is among the strictest in the country. This law, however, has not prevented sizeable numbers of illegal guns from entering the Commonwealth from states with lax gun laws.

In Great Britain, it is also illegal to regularly carry a firearm on the street. A certificate holder must keep his weapons and ammunition in a safe place when not using them, and can only legally transport them to a place where they can be properly used.

In the United States, several states do not regulate the carrying of handguns at all, while others, such as Massachusetts require a license.

Further, personal or household protection is not considered to be a valid cause for a private person to possess a handgun in Great Britain. Technically it is not illegal, but the Home Office has unofficially defined its "good reasons" for having a handgun as sporting purposes and target shooting only.

Not that Britons aren't worried about rising firearms crime rates, particularly in London. In May, the Home Office released a "green paper," compiled by a committee of police officers and government officials, proposing to stiffen firearms laws.

As the green paper points out, there is "a growth in the use of firearms in crime" in Britain, a trend that parallels a general crime increase that has been going on for some time. Most of the increase, the government says, is caused by the use of shotguns and air weapons. The certification process for shotguns is not as stringent as handguns and rifles, while air weapons are generally not certified at all.

These two types of guns accounted for three out of every four firearms offenses in 1971, while handguns were involved in only 14 percent. That, the government says, is why it wants to bring shotguns and air weapons under the same control as handguns.

After a current "consultation period"—during which citizens can voice their reactions to the proposals of the green paper—the government is expected to produce a "white paper," or actual bill.

Within this new legislation, the government does not intend to leave its stricter handgun regulations untouched. It proposes to specify exactly what should, or should not, count as good reasons for possessing a handgun or rifle, thus making its current unofficial policy statutory. It wants also to ban future certification of gun collectors and persons who keep guns as trophies or souvenirs.

Says British Home Secretary Robert Carr: "In my view, the question is not whether we should have stricter controls, but the kind of stricter controls which should be introduced."

Negative reaction to the new proposals has come primarily from shooting groups and trade organizations which do not want stringent certification of shotguns. But Britain's "gun lobby" is minuscule when compared to that in the United States: its National Rifle Assn. (NRA) has 15,000 members while the American NRA claims one million strong. Like its American counterpart, the British gun lobby takes the position that the answer to gun crime is a firmer line in the courts.

The government takes a somewhat different view, stating in its green paper that "two kinds of measures are required for the prevention of crime—measures to reduce the opportunities open to the criminal, as well as those which provide for his punishment."

Home Secretary Carr said: "There is clear evidence that the ready availability of guns leads to their use in crime. A considerable minority of law-abiding people must be asked to put up with some increased inconvenience."

The government's opponents on the question argue that controls do not keep guns out of the hands of criminals. They claim that the results of official "amnesties"—seven periods since 1933 during which persons could turn in guns to police with no questions asked—indicate there may be as many uncertified handguns as certified.

But the government feels that most of these are turned in by law-abiding citizens holding them as souvenirs from the war years. Indeed, the numbers turned in during amnesties have been dropping since 1946.

Besides, Britons seem to feel that even if there are a few illegal guns as legal ones, the total number is so small compared to the United States that they are thankful for strong controls.

"We must ask ourselves," the government states through its green paper, "what the situation would have been with no controls, or weaker controls."

Tony Judge, an executive of the Police Federation, Britain's police trade union, this week summed up the feelings of his countrymen: "We believe the only way to prevent expansion of the criminal use of firearms is to stop it when it's very small," he said.

"We admit that the number of incidents of armed crime is rising each year," he added, "but compared to the United States, it's infinitesimal, isn't it?"

	Handguns	Dealers	Murders
United States.....	35,000,000	150,000	8,991
Great Britain.....	57,000	2,500	7

Note: Chart compares the United States with England and Wales in 1971.

SHORTAGES ON OTHER MATERIALS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, this country is experiencing shortages in basic materials the likes of which we have not seen since World War II. Oil and gas are receiving the greatest attention, but other industries are suffering from shortages as well.

Two firms in my district in New York City are responsible for most of the wire mesh and concrete reinforcing bars used in the construction industry. They have countless numbers of orders on hand, but cannot obtain sufficient supplies of steel for fabrication. The question is why?

This administration appears more concerned about keeping its friends abroad than providing for the needs of people here at home. We are exporting oil. We are exporting large supplies of food commodities. We are exporting scrap metal, the basic raw material for fabricated steel. This exportation has got

to stop. America's needs must be met first.

Now there are those in the administration who allege there is no shortage in the fabricated steel industry. Of course, these are the same people who said there would be ample wheat, oil, and gas. The figures, though, prove the fact that there is a serious shortage.

A survey of New York users of steel reinforcing bars and wire mesh showed the following:

Ten major projects employing over 1,000 tradesmen were receiving between 25 and 50 percent of their requirements;

A combined school and apartment building project being constructed by the Board of Education suffered a 20 percent cutback in its workforce and expects to shut down shortly;

Several housing projects for the elderly and the poor are either sharply cutback or shut down as a result of a shortage in steel products.

The crisis in the steel fabrication industry is a result of two major problems: diminished supplies in the face of increased demand and price controls on the reinforcing bars.

The supply problem developed when demand for steel rose to unprecedented heights. Mills are now running at capacity and setting records for production. Backlogs of orders are mounting. At the same time, imports which had posed a threat to the American steel industry a few years ago have now fallen off considerably. Total imports in 1972 were 358,216 tons. For the first 7 months of this year, imports were less than 100,000 tons. Similarly, exports have increased. In 1971, 40,540 tons of steel reinforcing bars were exported. In 1972, 22,416 tons were exported. For the first 8 months of this year almost 70,000 tons of rebars were exported with records expected to be set in the remaining months of the year.

Moreover, concrete reinforcing bars are produced in mills after demands are met for carbon bars and bar shapes which bring substantially higher prices. The latter are used by the automotive industry which had a peak year in 1973 and expect big sales next year.

A better balance between production of these various bars would be possible if the Cost of Living Council would permit an increase in the price of reinforcing bars and if it would permit such increases to be passed on dollar for dollar to the ultimate consumer. Otherwise, no company will manufacture these reinforcing bars at a loss as they presently must do.

The fact is many very important construction projects are going undone or are moving at a snail's pace because of lack of supplies. The construction industry has suffered a marked downturn in activity throughout the Nation. Lack of the basic building materials is a major factor in this decline.

What can be done to solve the problem? First a ban on all exports of reinforcing bars and wire mesh as well as an embargo on the export of scrap metal must be implemented immediately by the President.

Second, the Cost of Living Council should approve price increases in the finished products representing the increased costs of raw materials. The head-in-the-sand approach of the Cost of Living Council ignores the realities of the current market situation.

Third, a temporary relaxation of pollution control standards should be authorized by the President to permit steel mills now idle as a result of these laws to start producing again.

Unfortunately, these three actions require a response from the President, who has been reluctant to do anything to upset his export plan, to deter his price program or to help the American consumer.

I will be circulating a letter for which I am seeking cosponsors asking the Cost of Living Council to approve price increases for steel reinforcing bars and similar products as soon as possible and to permit pass through of increased costs in raw materials in much the same way as such costs are permitted to be passed through in the petroleum industry.

In addition to the letter, I am urging my colleagues in the Senate on the Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee to approve legislation now being considered by them that would provide mandatory controls on the export of scrap metal and steel products.

I urge my colleagues in the House to join me in these two efforts so that we can save a vital industry from total disruption and possible destruction. We must act quickly.

PHYLLIS KILBY: FIGHTING FOR THE FARMER

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important segments of the economy in the First Congressional District of Maryland is agriculture. As in every profession or occupation, there are always people who stand out because of their talent and ability. Recently, the Maryland Farm News published by the Maryland Farm Bureau of which I am a member published an article about Phyllis Kilby, one of the real leaders in our State's agricultural community.

At 25, Mrs. Kilby is the chairman of the State's Young Farmer Committee, and I am proud to have her as resident of my district in Cecil County. I know her personally, and I commend to the Members this excellent article. The article follows:

CECIL COUNTY'S PHYLLIS KILBY—FIGHTING FOR THE FARMER

For the daughter of a Pennsylvania steelworker, it was quite an adjustment becoming the wife of a Maryland farmer.

"It took me a while to get used to the hours and to the seven-day work week," said Phyllis Kilby, "but now I'm deeply committed to fighting for this way of life."

It is this struggle for existence that Mrs. Kilby has been concerned with during the past year in her position as chairman of the State's Young Farmer Committee.

"Young farmers are definitely the future of the Maryland Farm Bureau," she said, "and we've tried this year to move toward more of an action-oriented approach."

This approach hopefully will pay dividends in the next few years, she explained, in terms of young farmers being elected to Farm Bureau positions and in terms of the young farmers acting as a pressure group on the more established Farm Bureau constituency.

"Once you see what the farmer is fighting for, it makes you want to start fighting for it too," she said, "and this is an industry that is heading for extinction unless we do something."

When she was 18 years old and living in Pennsylvania, Mrs. Kilby never dreamed of being involved in the farmer's struggles. Then she met Bill Kilby, got married, and the turn-about began.

The Kilbys farm 230 acres with Mr. Kilby's brother and father in Colora, Cecil County. Most of their operation is dairy, and they've been experiencing the problems facing all dairy farmers these days.

Some people felt Mrs. Kilby was too young at age 25 to handle the State Chairmanship. But she says "I'm pleased with what we've done this year; we've even made a bit of headway with the Board of Directors—at least they don't think Young Farmers is a token group anymore."

Four new YF groups have been organized this year. In addition the YF programs have taken on an action-type structure. Typical of this approach was the annual tour of the Legislature in Annapolis.

"In past years we went just to see how things operated, but this year we went to learn how we could become more effective and get things done in Annapolis," she explained.

"We're gearing up this year for real action efforts next year" she added. "These will come in the areas of reaching the consumer, new programs and legislative activities."

"Young farmers have to make themselves heard because they're the ones struggling to make farming work; they're the future."

DRINAN SUPPORTS PETROCHEMICAL INDUSTRY

HON. ROBERT F. DRINAN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. DRINAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted in favor of the mandatory allocation bill (S. 1570). This bill authorized the President to allocate crude oil and refined petroleum products to deal with existing or imminent shortages and dislocations in the national distribution system which jeopardize the public health, safety and welfare.

I recently had an opportunity to discuss the petrochemical crisis in my congressional district with leading businessmen in the New England plastics industry. These industries are in extremely difficult straits because of the shortage of petrochemicals, the harmful restraints of current phase IV price-control regulations upon petrochemicals and plastic feed stocks, and the excessive growth of petrochemical and plastic feedstock exports.

The legislative history contained in

the joint explanatory statement of the committee of conference on this bill gives some support to the petrochemical industry. The statement of conferees, in discussing this legislation, states that:

It is fully recognized that, in some instances, it may be impossible to satisfy one objective without sacrificing the accomplishment of another. For example, the President could not totally allocate propane to agricultural and rural heating needs and at the same time give consideration to the identified objective of preserving and fostering competition in the petrochemical industry. For this reason the direction to the President is qualified to permit the regulations to be constructive so as to accomplish the enumerated objective to the maximum extent practicable."

I am hopeful that the President will act on the sense of this legislation, which is intended to give him administrative flexibility in marshaling short supplies and allocating them to particular needs.

Other evidence of the intent to help the petrochemical industry can be found in the conference report. In discussing the use of the term "distillate" in this legislation, the conferees state:

It is the committee's intent, however, that this term also reach to include naphtha and benzene, so as to require the allocation of these products as may be necessary to accomplish the objective of restoring and fostering competition in the petrochemical sector of the industry. In this respect the Conference wishes to emphasize that, in expressing Congressional concern with fostering competition in the petrochemical industry, the Committee intends to also identify petrochemical feedstock needs as important end-uses for which allocations should be made.

Similarly, in discussing the allocation of propane, the conferees wish to make sure "that in allocating propane to farmers and others—the President—does not force petrochemical and glass plants across the country to close their doors." It is the express intent of the conferees that the President administer the allocation of fuels—including propane and other refined petroleum products—covered by this legislation in such a way as to avoid the closings of industry, significant unemployment or serious economic stress in specific areas or regions of the Nation.

Unfortunately, there is always the possibility that the President will not act to foster competition and maintain viability in the petrochemical industry. I am hopeful that the clearly enunciated objectives quoted above will give the President and his advisors the needed direction to maintain the viability of our petrochemical industry.

The worldwide energy shortage has seriously decreased our available supply of petrochemicals and plastic feedstocks. The petrochemicals, which uses about 5 percent of total petroleum products, has its very survival in severe jeopardy. I am hopeful that protection of this industry by these allocation provisions can be afforded to the petrochemical industry. It is unfortunate that no industry or segment of the society can expect to get through the present energy crisis with as much petroleum as they might want. With the burden of the shortages spread equitably, the situation is still not a good one, but is a vast improvement over the present one.

I am hopeful that this urgently needed legislation will overcome the pronounced shortcomings imposed on the petrochemical industry by export limitations and phase IV controls.

A BILL TO PROTECT THE CONSUMER AGAINST WORTHLESS MONEY ORDERS, AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 13, 1973

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I introduced a bill today to protect the consumer against worthless money orders. This bill will assure those persons who choose money orders to satisfy financial obligations that they will not be cheated out of their money due to fraud or the financial insolvency of the company from which the money order was purchased. It is particularly applicable to poor people who use the private money order business as a primary means to pay rent, utility bills, car payments, insurance payments, medical expenses and who can least afford to find their payments forfeit and their money gone when the money order bounces. Thousands of poor people, as well as all users of money orders could rely on workable, fair and inexpensive bonding and licensing arrangements to protect them in this important matter with a new measure of security and protection.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System to promulgate regulations to carry out the bill's intent, and provides criminal penalties for supplying false information or in other ways failing to comply with its provisions. Further, there is established a requirement that those persons engaged in the issuance of money orders be required to post a bond of \$50,000 for each State in which he does business with additional amounts required depending upon the number of sales outlets he maintains. In addition, these persons must file an information statement with the Federal Reserve District Office for the State in which he is operating, the content of which would be a matter of public record. Based upon satisfactory performance of these procedures, the issuer would then be granted a certificate of compliance by the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. No one could engage in the issuance of money orders without such a certificate.

Mr. Speaker, I should like to point out at this time that I am fully aware that many States have passed laws regulating the money order business. My bill recognizes this fact in that it permits the Federal Reserve Board to exempt from the operation of the Federal law those jurisdictions who laws in this area are as strong or stronger than those provided by my bill. Therefore, a State could choose to undertake the regulation itself merely by passing a strong law.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this to be a good bill and long overdue. I urge its enactment.

BAN THE HANDGUN—III

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, the New York Post's November 12 article, printed below, describing the shooting of a 78-year-old man while he was walking his dog and other shooting homicides, illustrates again the horrible consequences of allowing private citizens easy access to handguns. So long as we fail to implement strict gun controls we can do little but offer our sympathies to the victims and families of these vicious attacks:

MAN, 78, SHOT AS HE TAKES DOG FOR WALK

A 78-year-old Washington Heights man was shot early today while walking his dog near his home. He was in critical condition in Columbia-Presbyterian Medical Center.

Eugene Bunn, of 245 Bennett Av., was walking his dog near W. 192d St., a half-block from his home, about 1 a.m. when an unidentified person fired one shot, striking Bunn in the head, police said.

They said there apparently were no witnesses to the attack, in the hilly upper Manhattan neighborhood near Fort Tryon Park.

Police said no motive could be established. Bunn, who is retired, and his wife took turns several times each day walking the dog, a black and white mixed breed of medium size, according to neighbors.

The couple live on the second floor of a seven-story, 20-year-old building which overlooks rocks and shrubbery on the western side of Bennett Av.

BROOKLYN SHOOTING

Two hours later, in another shooting, a 27-year-old man was critically wounded in a dispute in a Brooklyn bar.

According to police, Earlito Perez was shot by an unknown man shortly before 3 a.m. in the Scarlett Lounge at 738 Franklin Av.

In a weekend shootout, a man in his 20s was shot and killed by an accomplice early yesterday when confused gunfire erupted during an unsuccessful attempt to rob Benny's Bar and Grill, 753 Union Av., the Bronx.

The confusion began when a customer at the bar, identified by police as Angelo Caldron, 28, protested the stickup by throwing a bar stool at one of the four or five gunmen.

In the ensuing gunfire, Caldron was slightly wounded and one of the bandits fatally shot the accomplice in the head. The robbers fled empty handed.

In the West Bronx yesterday, a shootout left one man dead and another wounded after an altercation in a tenement hallway at 1910 Davidson Av.

In the ground-floor hallway, police found an unidentified man, about 22 years old, dead with a bullet in the chest. They also found Russell Bannister, 22, a resident of the building, who was wounded with a bullet in the left leg.

THE HONORING OF CHIEF
GLENN ADAMS

HON. CLAIR W. BURGNER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. BURGNER. Mr. Speaker, tonight in La Mesa a dinner will be held to honor a man who has served our community

as chief of police since 1946. During the years since the end of World War II, Chief Glenn Adams has rendered outstanding service in both his professional capacity as police chief and his private capacity as a generous and concerned citizen.

As the chief of police, Glenn has presided over the expansion of the force from five men to its present 50. He has been an innovative chief of an innovative police force. Under his direction the La Mesa Police Force has updated their facilities, modernized their operation, developed the police ambulance concept and led the way toward higher educational requirements for officers.

As a respected leader in his profession, Chief Adams has served on the California Commission on Criminal Justice, served on the Professionalism Committee of State Police, was named Policeman of the Year by the La Mesa Exchange Club, and is a life member of the California Police Officer's Association.

As a neighbor, Glenn has not restricted his activities to his profession. Among his most noteworthy activities has been his work in the youth for decency movement. He has been involved in many youth oriented activities in the community and in the schools. In addition, he has given many hours to the Edgemoor Hospital as has his charming wife, Ruth.

I am sure that the citizens of La Mesa wish Glenn and Ruth the best of luck in their future endeavors. We have benefited greatly from having them as our neighbors and we are most grateful for their years of devoted service.

MAN AT THE TOP

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, this year, one of New Jersey's leading citizens, Alfred N. Sanzari, has been named "Man of the Year" by the Hackensack Chapter of UNICO International. This award, however, is just one of many given to my friend, Al Sanzari, during his career as one of our State's most respected businessmen and civic leaders.

In addition to having received wide acclaim as one of New Jersey's foremost builders, Mr. Sanzari serves on the board of one of our leading financial institutions, and has been a member of the Bergen County Housing Authority for 8 years.

Today, I salute Al Sanzari and thank him for his endless efforts to make Bergen County a better place for people to live. His neighbors have benefited from his vision, good sense, and integrity.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to share with my colleagues an article which appeared in the October issue of Bergen, the Bergen County Chamber of Commerce monthly magazine. The article, entitled "Al Sanzari/Man at the Top," provides us with additional insight into his successful and diversified career. The article follows:

Most successful men are content to excel in one field, but that is not the case with Alfred N. Sanzari of Hackensack, who has carved brilliant careers for himself in building, banking and public service. One of New Jersey's most honored builders, Mr. Sanzari is also a member of the board of one of the leading financial institutions in the state and is in his eighth year of service to Bergen County as a member of the Housing Authority.

Usually, when a man is that busy, his family life suffers, but Al Sanzari has proved exceptional here, too. He is a staunch family man who seldom misses a vacation with his wife, Mary, and is devoted to their three sons, two of whom are in business with their father.

Despite his success, Mr. Sanzari is essentially modest and he still lives in Hackensack, where he was born and educated. He left his hometown for service with the Office of Strategic Services in World War II, when he was under the famous Gen. William (Wild Bill) Donovan. Although he is reluctant to speak about his wartime exploits, Mr. Sanzari helped to pave the way for Allied landings on the continent of Europe by contacting partisans and members of the underground.

For a time after the war, it seemed that Al Sanzari would follow a career as a racing driver, for he was skillful at the wheel. He drove until the death of two close friends in racing crashes convinced him that he owed it to his wife and young son to follow a less risky occupation.

He had been involved in the building trades before the war and that experience, plus his foresight, led him into home building to satisfy the great demand for homes arising as the armed forces were demobilized. "I still did some racing," Mr. Sanzari recalled, "but when I started selling homes I knew I would never win the Indianapolis 500."

His interest in racing continues to this day and he owns several racers, including the ones used by his son, David, in amassing a cabinet full of trophies; and he never misses an Indianapolis race if he can help it. Because he knows the pit crews and drivers and appreciates the techniques of the racers, he enjoys the event vicariously, as if he were rolling into Victory Lane himself.

But Al Sanzari is no idle dreamer. He is a realist who knows that excellence in any field demands commitment, concentration and enthusiasm. Perhaps that is the key to his success: He never becomes bored, always looking for new challenges and new frontiers.

As an example of this, he has always been a forerunner among the builders in the country and the state. He was among the founders of the Home Builders Association of Northern New Jersey and he was among the first to advocate that the word "Home" be dropped from the title because he could see other facets of the construction field beckoning.

His Crest Haven Estates development in Wyckoff won an award from the National Association of Builders in 1957, but that did not prevent him from shifting to apartments because he felt that the one-family housing field was becoming saturated and there would be a need for apartments, too.

Consequently, he has built the Clinton Manor Apartments in Dover, the Madison Arms and Yorkview Arms in Hackensack, Nottingham Manor in Montvale, Georgian Arms in Woodbridge, Willow Gardens in Teaneck and at present is developing the Ivanhoe in Hackensack.

This is in addition to hundreds of homes built and sold in New Jersey, Florida and Massachusetts. Unlike some developers, Al Sanzari is a developer-owner so that all his tenants get the personal attention of the builder and are not dealing with a soulless corporation.

It was in the fifties, too, that Mr. Sanzari

decided to diversify. He felt that the housing market was still strong, but he felt that there also would be a demand for industrial space by companies seeking to tap the vast labor pool that Bergen County represented. As a result, he was one of the first of the successful post-World War II home builders to shift to the commercial and industrial construction field.

"Land that wasn't suitable for homes or apartments could be used for light industry or warehouses, I thought," Mr. Sanzari said, "and I felt that it would be a natural step in the growth of the county. Many towns that were seeking tax ratables did not want apartments, but they would take an attractive industrial building, so I put on another hat and went into the industrial construction field."

At present, Mr. Sanzari owns three industrial parks, comprising more than 200 acres and approximately 47 buildings, representing a multi-million dollar investment. All but 60,000 square feet of that space is leased to top-rated tenants who have exercised renewal clauses in virtually every case because they like doing business with Al Sanzari.

When he began looking for industrial land, he evolved a standard that came to be known as Sanzari's Law. The axiom goes this way: "If you can stand on the property a real estate man is showing you and you can see the towers of the George Washington Bridge or the Empire State Building, buy it." The formula has proved remarkably successful.

His first industrial park was in Little Ferry and because he was broadening his horizons, he called it the Horizon Industrial Park. His next move was farther south to the meadowlands area of South Hackensack, where he created the Horizon South Industrial Park. The consistency of names is an indication of Mr. Sanzari's loyalty; he seldom changes subcontractors and has had the same advertising agency for the last 25 years.

Mildred Cantrella, the controller for the many-faceted organization that has become known as Sanzari Enterprises, has been in Mr. Sanzari's employ for 23 years. Of late, some of the tasks Miss Cantrella performed in the past have been taken over by Bruce Selden, (a former employee of Touche-Ross, the leading accountants), who is director of finance.

Miss Cantrella is concerned with cash flow, billing and the like, while Mr. Selden works on mortgage placement, subcontractor bids and leasing. His leasing on the industrial side at present consists of finding a tenant for the one remaining building in the Horizon North Industrial Park in Norwood. After the buildings are occupied, they come under the supervision of Dominick Mancini, another long-time employee, who is income property manager.

The Norwood industrial park, developed along the lines of a college campus and dotted with companies engaged in research, represented another aspect of Mr. Sanzari's ability to anticipate the market. With meadowlands sites skyrocketing in price and with title questions cloudy there, he decided to turn to the northern part of the county, which, at that time, had virtually no industrial parks.

The Borough of Norwood had some low land that nearby residents used for a disposal area and although it was just off Broadway, the town fathers were not hopeful about its future. They weren't looking at the land with the visionary eyes of Al Sanzari, though.

"Actually, the big problem was drainage," Mr. Sanzari said. "I thought the proper engineering could solve the problem and could turn the tract into an attractive and valuable piece of property."

This has proved the case, but a lot of ingenuity went into the creation of the Norwood showplace. For instance, living trees

were moved to new locations on the site by bulldozer, a feat made possible by the wet conditions of the property. Such a stunt had never been attempted before, but the gamble paid off and only three of 14 trees so moved failed to bloom.

It was just about the time of the Horizon North development that Mr. Sanzari was getting more deeply involved with service on the Bergen County Housing Authority. The authority was becoming an active sponsor of development rather than just an administrative and advisory body and Mr. Sanzari's knowledge of building and construction was called on to save the county and its residents seeking shelter time and money.

Meanwhile, his career in banking was flourishing, too. He was induced to join the Board of Directors of what was then one of the smallest banks in Hackensack, City National Bank, by Harvey J. E. Milkon, an associate from the Builders Association. The bank grew and prospered and was taken over by First National State Bancorporation, New Jersey's first billion-dollar financial institution. Mr. Sanzari continued on the board of the First National State Bank of North Jersey, the designation for the multi-bank operation that grew out of City National.

Besides being a board member, Mr. Sanzari has been also one of First National State's best customers. He arranged through the bank the financing of the Ivanhoe, the \$7-million apartment on Beech Street and Overlook Avenue in Hackensack. This 24-story building, at present Hackensack's highest, towers over other structures in the area for other reasons besides height. The Ivanhoe represents a breakthrough in construction, with a design-system evolved by Massachusetts Institute of Technology with a grant from U.S. Steel.

Again vision played a role in a Sanzari enterprise. When the design system was explained to him, Mr. Sanzari could see the savings in time and labor costs that would be possible. He knew the apartment market was highly competitive, but he felt the new design would enable him to pass on considerable savings to his tenants in the form of lower rentals.

Schrenko Steel of Upper Saddle River put the system into operation, adapting new techniques to make the most of the new design. Basically, the system involves the use of staggered steel trusses and precast concrete panels, with the staggered trusses allowing for wider open spaces and consequently larger rooms.

Only 11 months elapsed from the start of construction to the opening of model apartments, a record for even a fast builder like Mr. Sanzari. To pass on the savings in financing costs and labor, he evolved a "package rental plan that included all charges—costs of cooking fuel, heating, air-conditioning, wall-to-wall carpeting, membership in swim and health club and space in the security-operated underground parking garage. Comparison shopping shows that no competing apartment can touch the Ivanhoe, where rentals start at \$290 for a studio unit.

"Bruce Selden and David Sanzari deserve credit for expediting work on the Ivanhoe," Mr. Sanzari said. "I told them timing is important and that the key to a successful operation is turning a debit to a credit as soon as possible. They've done a fine job of carrying out orders, following instructions and taking the initiative."

Never content to be doing one thing at a time, Mr. Sanzari was preparing another venture even while the Ivanhoe was being erected. This involved the building of a hotel on the site of the Stag farm, a holding dating back to the Dutch colonization of Bergen County. A farmhouse whose foundations are 275 years old stands on the property and Mr. Sanzari offered to donate the structure to any historical society that was willing to move it. To give the various in-

terested parties time to make arrangements, he delayed groundbreaking at the site three times.

"I would like to see some remnant of Bergen County's past preserved," Mr. Sanzari said. "I'm perfectly willing to give the structure away, but I don't think the past should stand in the way of progress."

Perhaps that is his whole philosophy: Never stand still, keep moving ahead. It's a code of action that has won him many honors, including a place in the Hall of Fame of the Builders Association of New Jersey, designation as "Builder of the Year" in 1965 by both the state and the regional builders' group and selection this year as "Man of the Year" by the Hackensack Chapter of UNICO. He has served the Builders Association of Northern New Jersey as president and is still on the board of directors of the regional group, the state organization and the National Association of Home Builders.

A unique personality, Al Sanzari enjoys the confidence of not only management—as represented by the builders—but also of labor—as represented by the trade unions. As a result, he is a trustee for the Bergen County Masons on both their pension fund and welfare fund and holds the same position with the Bergen County Laborers and carpenters. He is a great believer in apprentice programs and has fostered the training of new men in the crafts by serving on the apprenticeship committees of the three unions, also. Another tribute to his character is his recent appointment to the Hackensack Rent Control Board.

Despite his success, Al Sanzari never forgets his humble origins and his family. His brothers have been his business associates for years and a memorial plaque to John Sanzari, killed last year in a construction accident, hangs in his office on West Franklin Street. Another brother, Pat, has been a vice president and consultant to Sanzari Enterprises for 25 years, but more than that he has been a confidant who never fails to be encouraging in addition to David, another son, Ben, is part of Mr. Sanzari's business. His other son, Alfred Jr., is in business for himself.

Mr. and Mrs. Sanzari have a home in Hallandale, Fla., and are looking forward to moving into a penthouse atop the Ivanhoe, where they'll have a striking view of both the New York skyline and the Ramapo Mountains. Mrs. Sanzari, his high-school sweetheart, says her husband hasn't changed much over the years and is unlikely to be different living in a penthouse. It seems that although Al Sanzari might wear many hats, his head size hasn't changed any because of his many successes.

RESTORE TRADITIONAL DATES

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, as a sponsor of H.R. 5981, to restore the traditional dates of Memorial Day to May 20 and Veterans Day to November 11, I still hope to see action taken on the legislation by next May.

Changing the traditional observance date of Veterans Day has caused particular distress among the group most concerned with it. Our Nation's veterans have, in fact, continued to hold ceremonies on November 11 to honor their fallen comrades. This past Sunday such commemorations were conducted at Ar-

lington Cemetery and all across the country.

In view of the strong feelings about the original Armistice Day and Memorial Day dates, I strongly urge Congress to exempt these days from the "Monday holiday" law.

The following is a newspaper article, describing this week's observances in Erie County, N.Y.:

**VETERANS' GROUPS MARK THE ORIGINAL DAY
TO HONOR THE NATION'S WAR DEAD**

A number of services honoring veterans were held in respect to tradition Sunday, on the date which had been observed as Veterans Day for many years.

The American Legion is on record in opposing a "blatant disregard for historical fact" in changing the traditional Veterans Day observance date from Nov. 11, its county commander said in 9:30 a.m. ceremonies at Forest Lawn Cemetery.

Cmdr. Leroy L. Winkelsas spoke during a wreath-laying ceremony at the Legion Monument. The holding of the service at that time was, in itself, a protest against moving the observance of what originally was designated as Armistice Day from the date on which World War I ended to the fourth Sunday in October, for the expediency of a three-day weekend.

"Unfortunately for the world," Winkelsas said, "the name of Armistice Day proved all too fitting. According to the dictionary definition, the word armistice means a brief cessation of hostilities, and that is what America experienced."

GRAVES DECORATED

The talk was preceded by decoration of veterans' graves. Wreaths also were laid at the monument by Mrs. Annette Klubek, chairman of the ladies' auxiliary of the Legion, and Robert Trowbridge, chef de gare of the 40 & 8 Society.

Others participating were the Rev. Raymond J. Koslowski, county chaplain; Joseph S. Serba, Jr., county bugler; and the Minute Men Firing Squad of Troop I Post.

At the traditional Veterans Day dinner, held Sunday night at Niagara Frontier Post 1041, 533 Amherst St., Winkelsas received the official warrant of county commander. Joseph Paris, director of the Veterans Administration Hospital, was the speaker.

VFW DONATION

At Rich Stadium in Orchard Park, Erie County Executive Edward V. Regan and others participated in a ceremony before the start of the Bills-Bengals football game, dedicating a veterans' memorial. It is a bronze plaque which will be placed on a boulder at the Abbott Rd. entrance to the stadium.

The monument was provided by the posts of the Erie County Council, Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW), on behalf of all veterans. Replicas were presented to officials of the Bills football club and the county.

County commanders of the American Legion, VFW and Amvets, as well as other representatives of the county and the Bills, also participated.

The United Veterans Committee of Buffalo and Erie County held a ceremony honoring the nation's veterans at 11 a.m. at the Doughboy Monument in front of the State Armory, 184 Connecticut St.

Hamburg Post 527, American Legion, held ceremonies in the post at 11 a.m., and a dinner at 6:30 p.m.

Members of Riverside Post 1010, American Legion, attended services at Forest Ave. Christian Church at 11 a.m., which was followed by a brunch at the post, 40 Hartman Pl. Members then conducted services at monuments in front of Riverside High School, in Riverside Park and at the park's casino.

MEMORIAL ON SPAN

The United Veterans' Council of the Tonawandas held an observance at the World War I Monument in the center of the Bascule Bridge between Tonawanda and North Tonawanda at 1 p.m. A wreath was cast into the Barge Canal by members of the Marine Corps League.

The council also sponsored a program at 2 p.m. in the council chambers at Tonawanda City Hall, including a band concert. A special plaque was presented to the Rev. Charles W. Hobbs, minister of the United Church of Christ of Pendleton, for his services to the council for the past 15 years.

At 4 p.m., a flagpole donated by the Boston Amvets Post to Post 26 Amvets, 600 Ward Rd., North Tonawanda, was dedicated at the latter location.

**CONTINUING EDUCATION FOR
WORKERS**

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, continuing education is becoming an increasingly important aspect of the education process. It is a necessary process for professionals as evidenced by the many updating seminars and meetings held by professional organizations. Continuing education makes sense for senior citizens. Young people take advantage of continuous or continuing education. Why not continuing education for workers?

The following article appeared in the November 1973 issue of the Progressive. It tells about a program of continuing education for French workers. I commend it to my colleagues:

EDUCATING FRENCH WORKERS

Betty and Francoise are secretaries performing multifarious chores at insurance firms. Although Betty works in New York City and Francoise in Paris, their daily routines are surprisingly similar. Every weekday morning, each is faced with stacks of boring letters and forms to type for her employer. They share the nine-to-five doldrums and the prospect of a daily round-trip on rush-hour subways. Each is entitled to three weeks of paid vacation a year, plus ten days of sick leave with pay. They spend unoccupied moments thinking about the vacation, which always seems remote.

The only major difference between them is that next year, while Betty attempts to get one extra week off and perhaps applies for a job as secretary to the assistant marketing manager, Francoise will be studying poetry, full-time, at the Sorbonne, at almost her full salary, with no loss of job seniority. In France, thanks to a recently introduced education program, Francoise's year of study is not a privilege extended by her employer; it is her right.

The program is called "la Formation Permanente" (Continuing Education). It became law in July 1971, and is credited to Jacques Delors, who served in the government under former Premier Chaban Delmas. Basically, the law entitles every French worker who has been employed by a firm for more than two years, and who has not received a degree in the last three years, to one year of full-time, or 1,200 hours of part-time, study or training, financed by the worker's employer and the government. The study or training program may, but need not necessarily, be work-related. Thus, theoretically, an auto mechanic may study philosophy,

poetry, mathematics, or other equally "useless" subjects at his employer's expense. If the employee is less than eighteen years of age, he or she need have been employed by the firm for only six months. The program covers not only the nineteen million French agricultural and industrial workers, but the almost two million foreign workers in France as well. Only employees less than five years from retirement are ineligible. Although government workers, with the exception of school teachers, are not currently covered, a similar education program is being developed for them.

During the program's first year of operation, an estimated 300,000 workers were enrolled in full or part-time study or training. Officials estimate that half a million workers throughout the country will be participating this year.

Although many American vocational schools, community colleges, and university extension programs offer free or low-cost educational opportunities, neither the American employer nor the Government is legally bound to pay workers' salaries while they study. In France, Continuing Education is financed by the government and employers. Under the law, employers must now invest 0.3 per cent of their gross payroll in worker study. By 1976, the law calls for employers to spend two per cent of their total payrolls on the project, ensuring that workers can study and still earn almost their full salaries. During the study period the government contributes to the worker's social security account.

The program is unique. And it is especially remarkable since it was developed in France, a nation not known for progressive social legislation. There was opposition to the plan when it was proposed. Though many employers supported the concept of manpower training, they doubted that workers should have the "right" to study non-job-connected subjects. Gradually, however, France's major industrialists realized that Continuing Education was good for business, since most workers would probably choose to study job-related subjects. In addition, employers sensed that the program would migrate worker alienation and dissatisfaction, which had contributed substantially to the turmoil of May 1968, when French shops, factories, and universities were closed by anti-government strikes and street fighting.

Educators feared the program would place an insupportable strain on resources of the already overburdened and underfinanced university system. Thus, some worker education programs, it was argued, would be left to industrialists to establish themselves and to *merchandises de soupe*—those "soup merchants" who would profit by setting up courses and collecting tuition fees. The government, however, anticipated the potential educational rip-off factor, and provided that a special division of the Ministry of Labor would be responsible for certifying all study and training centers. If a program does not have the government's approval, it cannot receive employers' francs. As it turns out, business seems to be booming in the Continuing Education field. Universities have strengthened extension programs; in areas without a university, several companies have joined together to set up job-connected training requested by their employees.

The major problem encountered so far is human inertia. The government has launched a broad campaign of educating the working population about the new program, but has encountered some difficulties in interesting its citizens in returning to school and taking advantage of their new right. French workers, moreover, are still suspicious, despite legal guarantees, that enrollment may result in forfeiture of a desired promotion or withholding of a salary increase. Thus, even though the program is

being filled, retraining centers have not been deluged, as was predicted, by hordes of applicants.

Continuing Education, which gets such limited backing in the United States, has created quite a stir in Europe. Several Common Market nations—the Netherlands in particular—have been observing the program's progress with great interest. French officials predict the program will eventually spread throughout the Market countries.

French industry has come to view its monetary contribution to the program as a means of bringing the French working force into the Twentieth Century. French companies, above all, recognize that the labor force must be "industrialized" if France is to continue its rapid rate of economic expansion. An alienated work force, whose skills are antiquated and technologically unsophisticated, would inevitably limit economic growth. The government's commitment to the program is demonstrated by its willingness to permit up to two per cent of the labor force to be enrolled in the program in any single year, though France, with an unemployment rate of only 2.3 per cent (generally considered full employment by economists), imports foreign labor.

The program has also served to buy off the leftist sentiments of many French workers—in a country in which about forty per cent of the population voted Communist or Socialist in the last election. French unions, whose rhetoric, at least, is much more left-oriented than that of their American counterparts, originally objected to the education project on ideological grounds: they did not want to be "integrated" into the capitalist system. The program's creator, Delors, denies that unions have impeded the project, but government officials report that, even now, unions are reluctant to support it.

Nevertheless, by any measure, *la Formation Permanente* is a stroke of genius on the part of the French government. It provides French workers an opportunity to train for their own advancement or cultural enrichment, and it helps France to increase worker productivity and counter worker discontent.

CALL FOR ACTION AGAINST POLLUTION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, special concern to the residents of the Chicago metropolitan area is a problem on pollution in Lake Michigan. Every effort must be taken to preserve this Great Lake from the pollutants from the North Shore suburbs and Wisconsin.

A very timely editorial was carried by Chicago radio station WIND which directs special attention to the complications involved.

[Broadcast Nov. 2-4, 1973]

POLLUTION

(By Philip E. Nolan)

On a recent Call for Action show on WIND, Dr. David Comey made a simple, but often overlooked, point about pollution and Lake Michigan.

Almost no pollution is caused by Chicago, primarily because Chicago pollutes the Chicago River and it flows Downstate. The culprits, in the case of Lake Michigan, are the North Shore suburbs and Wisconsin.

Dr. Comey is Director of Environmental

Research for the Business and Professional People for the Public Interest and he says the chief battleground in the fight against pollution is no longer demonstrations and public events, but the courts.

Both of Dr. Comey's points were focused the other day in a major victory. A Federal Judge ruled that Illinois could sue Milwaukee in Federal Court on grounds it is polluting the lake.

We believe the Judge is right. Polluters should not be able to hide behind technicalities, nor use statelaws as an escape.

Hopefully, the decision will speed the mutual concern of Wisconsin and Illinois for our environment.

A NATIONAL TRIBUTE TO THE CLERGY AND PARISHIONERS OF ST. MARY'S ROMAN CATHOLIC SLOVAK CHURCH OF PASSAIC, N.J., DURING ITS 80TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, earlier today I called your attention to the centennial celebration of the city of Passaic in my Eighth Congressional District, State of New Jersey. During 1973 our people are also celebrating the 80th anniversary of the founding of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Slovak Church located in the city of Passaic. I am honored and privileged to call this historic event to your attention also and request that you join with me in saluting our citizens of Slovak heritage who over these past 80 years have, by their example, engendered the esteem and respect of the residents of my congressional district and the State of New Jersey their steadfast faith, hope, and charity in promulgating the richness of their religious culture through the establishment of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Slovak Church.

Mr. Speaker, I know you and our colleagues here in the Congress will want to join with me in extending our heartiest congratulations and best wishes to the pastor of St. Mary's, Father John J. Demkovich; associate pastor, Father Augustine Sklenar, S.D.; and pastor-emeritus, Msgr. Andrew J. Romanak, P.A.; and all of the members of St. Mary's congregation on this historic occasion.

The quality of the leadership of members of the most reverend clergy and our citizens of Slovak heritage who settled in the city of Passaic, N.J., and founded St. Mary's Church is most eloquently intertwined in the history of the church which appeared in the city of Passaic's centennial journal under the authorship of the most distinguished editor of New Jersey's highly prestigious Slovak news publication, the Slovak Catholic Sokol. It gives me great pleasure to request your permission to place this statement on the history of St. Mary's Catholic Slovak Church at this point in our historic journal of Congress, as follows:

ST. MARY'S ROMAN CATHOLIC SLOVAK CHURCH OF PASSAIC, N.J.

For the priests and parishioners of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Slovak Church, located on Monroe and First Streets in Passaic, it is a three-fold celebration: The Centennial of our City, the 80th anniversary of the establishment of this beautiful church and the Golden Jubilee of its pastor-emeritus, Msgr. Andrew J. Romanak, P.A.

The Slovaks settled in Passaic permanently on December 19, 1879. They established their first Society of St. Stephen in 1882, and the Parish of St. Mary was established in 1893. Father Samuel Bejla of Bayonne, N.J., celebrated the mass for them, in the basement of St. Nicholas Church. In 1894, Father Bernard M. Skulik was appointed their pastor. He was followed by Father B. Kwiatkowski and Father Joseph L. Ligday, who started a Sunday School under the church, for the children. After his departure, Father John Sheppard of St. Nicholas Church was administrator. In April, 1896, Father John E. Polyakovics was appointed pastor. He started a regular school under the church, with an organist as teacher. He was followed by Father Ignatius J. Jaskovitz, who was the first Slovak parish priest in America. In late summer of 1898, Father Emery A. Haitinger was appointed pastor and remained in the parish for 24 years. A beautiful church was built during his pastorate in 1902 and dedicated by Bishop John O'Connor in 1903. In 1922 Father D. Salamon was appointed pastor and served until his death in November, 1945. He was followed as pastor, by Msgr. Andrew J. Romanak, A.P., who after reaching the mandatory age of 75 retired in December, 1971 and Bishop Lawrence B. Casey appointed the present pastor, Father John J. Demkovich.

The Sisters of St. Dominic from Mt. St. Mary on the Hudson, Newburgh, N.Y. were invited to teach in the Parochial School by Father Haitinger and have taught several generations for the glory of God and the benefit of mankind.

A new school was erected in 1929 and served as Pope Pius XII Diocesan High School until the new high school was erected. The Parish is blessed with many sons and daughters, who entered the service of God and their country. God Bless and protect our city and its inhabitants.

Mr. Speaker, we do, indeed, extend our congressional salute to the pastor, Father John J. Demkovich and to all of his associate priests, sisters, and parishioners of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Slovak Church of Passaic, N.J., in national tribute to the elegance of their faith and outstanding good works on behalf of our fellow man which has truly enriched our community, State, and Nation.

NIXON'S POLICY ON ENERGY: BLAME CONGRESS

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, the column by Roland Evans and Robert Novak in Monday's Washington Post examines the administration's handling of the energy crisis and efforts by the President to blame Congress for causing the crisis. On the first score, Evans and Novak conclude:

There is, therefore, a one-word answer to the question of who is running the government's energy policy: nobody. The consequence is a sloppy, sluggish performance by the Administration which scarcely supports Mr. Nixon's attempts to blame the crisis on Congress.

Indeed it does not. As for the rest of it, Evans and Novak point out that the President ignored Senator HENRY JACKSON's letter of June 1972, warning about U.S. dependence on Middle Eastern oil, and also did nothing about Senator JACKSON's call last December that he name an energy adviser.

Last week, Majority Leader THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR., replied to the President's charge by declaring:

If anything, this Congress has done more about energy than the Administration.

He noted that the President is only now using the standby authority to make mandatory fuel allocations that Congress gave him last April, and that the bill requiring him to allocate fuels has taken so long to pass because the administration deliberately stalled it through the summer and fall.

In terms of initiatives, consider the President's promise of June 29 to devote an extra \$100 million to energy research in the current fiscal year. His promise was made 2 days after the House had voted an additional \$23.6 million for coal resource development, geothermal energy research, and other energy research in the interior appropriation bill, over and above the President's request. The Appropriations Committee report had declared:

The Committee believes that a vigorous energy research program in all areas of energy use, resource management, and conservation is vital if Government and industry are to provide the Nation with a sustained and reliable energy supply in the future. The 23% increase in energy research provided in this bill will help reach this objective.

Mr. Speaker, I include the Evans and Novak column at this point:

MR. NIXON'S POLICY ON ENERGY:

BLAME CONGRESS

(By Rowland Evans and Robert Novak)

An elite group of 32 businessmen invited to the White House last Wednesday for an advance peek at the new energy program also became witnesses to a momentary clash between President Nixon and his domestic counselor, Melvin R. Laird, which reveals much about both the administration's handling of the energy crisis and its general strategy.

Laird was listing energy legislation now in the congressional pipeline when he was interrupted by an obviously irritated President. "But there's nothing on my desk now, is there?" Mr. Nixon asked his counselor. The impression given the businessmen: While Laird was trying to solve the fuel shortage in close cooperation with Congress, the President wanted to blame Congress for causing the crisis.

This contrast between the President and his counselor transcends the energy crisis. But in this case, the presidential attempt to lay blame on Congress particularly infuriates Democratic leaders on Capitol Hill who believe their early warnings about the energy crunch were ignored by the White House. In truth, key administration officials admit the President delayed until it was too late to prevent disaster. Even at this eleventh hour, the administration's handling of the crisis seems fuzzy and uncoordinated.

Sen. Henry M. Jackson (D-Wash.), chairman of the Senate Interior Committee, can claim to be the leading Cassandra. His June 13, 1972, letter to the President warning about U.S. dependence on Middle Eastern oil was ignored. So was Jackson's Dec. 10, 1972, call for Mr. Nixon to name an energy adviser.

One reason why Jackson's warnings went unheeded was that domestic policy chief John D. Ehrlichman then tightly controlled decisions on energy as on everything except foreign affairs. Besides being spread thin by trying to monopolize domestic policy, Ehrlichman was busy attempting to keep from going down with the Watergate wreck when energy decisions were needed.

When Ehrlichman finally fell last April, the dominant administration voice in the energy field became Deputy Secretary of the Treasury William Simon. A Wall Street investment expert, Simon at first opposed mandatory fuel allocations but later was convinced by Jackson and other congressional leaders of their necessity.

But on June 29 Gov. John Love of Colorado was appointed energy adviser and quickly ruled against mandatory allocations, delaying for weeks what Democrats in Congress long had been urging. Meanwhile, Simon disappeared from the energy picture along with his valuable expertise. As the crisis deepened last week, Simon was in Nassau attending a Time, Inc., seminar.

Love, popular and well regarded as governor, has been an almost totally unrelieved disappointment here. Even administration officials admit he lacks the background, temperament and governmental powers to be energy adviser. In fact, he does not want the power. One proposal to consolidate the government's scattered energy policymaking functions under him was killed by Iowa.

There is, therefore, a one-word answer to the question of who is running the government's energy policy: nobody. The consequence is a sloppy, sluggish performance by the administration which scarcely supports Mr. Nixon's attempts to blame the crisis on Congress.

When Jackson on Oct. 17 unveiled his legislation for fuel self-sufficiency, Love's office replied it would soon send up its own bill. But one week later, Laird informed Jackson that the many government departments involved had not agreed on anything. That same day, Love told the Senate Interior Committee the administration had no contingency plans in case of an Arab oil cut-off.

Mr. Nixon might not have avoided the crunch even had he heeded Jackson's first warnings. In any event, it is too late now to avoid terribly painful economic consequences resulting from the Arab cut-off. ("It's going to be wild in a few weeks," predicts one consultant who advises the administration.)

Nevertheless, almost everybody concerned believes Mr. Nixon should belatedly put somebody in charge of the crisis to at least minimize the economic dislocation. In business circles, Secretary of the Treasury George Shultz is talked about as the best choice. But Shultz, overburdened now as Mr. Nixon's economic adviser, does not want the job and probably won't get it.

Besides, the White House seems more interested in goading Congress. Rep. Torbert Macdonald (D-Mass.), chairman of the House subcommittee handling energy legislation and a critic of the President's energy policies who was not invited to last Wednesday's briefing, Macdonald said nothing publicly but, in private, trumpeted his rage in unprintable language. Although the snub to Macdonald might well be the product of now familiar incompetency at the Nixon White House, it also coincided with Mr. Nixon's desire for a cold war with Congress

while a fuel-short nation faces a freezing winter.

RESTRICTING USE OF GOVERNMENT LIMOUSINES

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing on behalf of the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT) and myself a House concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress regarding the use of chauffeur driven limousines by the Federal Government.

Our resolution calls on all agencies of the Federal Government to issue regulations severely limiting the use of chauffeur driven limousines and to provide that the motors of such limousines must be turned off when such limousines are parked and occupied only by the drivers.

The basis of this resolution concerns three significant points. Namely, the need to conserve gasoline; the need to prevent air pollution, and the ever present need to curtail unnecessary spending.

On one day early this fall, a beautiful clear day when the temperature was 76 degrees in Washington, I noted several chauffeur occupied limousines in the Rayburn Building horseshoe after coming back from a subcommittee meeting with reference to the Clean Air Act. The motors of these limousines were running. This not only contributed to air pollution, but also wasted gasoline.

At this time, when our attention is turned to the great need to conserve fuels, I feel the Federal Government should set an example. Passage of this resolution would be a step in that direction.

NEW INCOME FLOOR FOR SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw attention to the little-known fact that some 27,000 Clevelanders and an estimated 2.8 million people nationwide, may miss out on a new Federal income supplement program, if they are not made aware of new, liberalized eligibility requirements.

The supplementary security income program—SSI—which will go into effect in January, can benefit thousands of people in my city who are either over 65, blind, or disabled. The AFL-CIO is to be commended for spearheading on national campaign to bring the news to the people who may not have heard, due to lack of publicity. AFL-CIO social security Director Bert Seidman has termed the program "a landmark in the history of American social legislation."

It sets a national income floor for per-

sons in those categories of over 65, blind, or disabled, who live on \$130 a month—individually—or \$195—for a couple. Because of exclusions of portions of earnings and other income, many persons with income above those levels will still qualify for supplementary payments.

Starting in January, 1974, the Federal Government will take over both the financing and operation of the now jointly financed Ohio and Federal social security program at the \$130 and \$195 income guarantee level.

Those already under the Ohio State program as of November 5, 1973, will be automatically covered come January. They do not have to submit a new application.

But because of the generally liberalized eligibility standards set by the Federal law, an estimated 27,000 Clevelanders not now under the State program can qualify.

I quote from the AFL-CIO news article:

The 65-year age requirement does not apply to persons who are either (1) blind, which is defined as having vision no greater than 20/200 with glasses in the better eye or (2) disabled, defined as unable to do any kind of substantial paid work because of a physical disability which can be expected to last at least 12 months or to end in death.

They must have incomes of less than \$130 a month for single persons or \$195 for couples. But excluded from calculating income are:

The first \$65 a month of wages or self-employment income.

The first \$20 a month of other income, a category which would include social security or pension benefits. Thus a person receiving a \$100-a-month social security payment could exclude \$20 of it and receive the difference between \$80 and the federal guarantee of \$130, plus any additional supplement that might be provided by his state.

While applicants may not have assets of more than \$1,500, this limitation does not apply to a home and car of reasonable value, personal possessions and life insurance with a modest cash surrender value.

I have stocked my district office with two HEW pamphlets which further explain the new supplementary income: "Your Claim for Supplemental Income" and "Supplemental Income for Disabled, Blind and Aged."

It will still be possible to apply in January for January benefits, according to the Cleveland office of the Social Security Administration. But the sooner newly eligible people apply, the sooner they will benefit.

The Social Security Administration has 8 local offices in the Cleveland area: main office, 1246 East 9th Street, room 793; 50 Severance Circle—suite 300; 10645 Euclid Avenue; 1024 East 152d Street; 6405 Superior Avenue; 9333 Miles Avenue; 2012 West 25th Street—room 810; and 6315A Pearl Road, Parma Heights.

THERE MUST BE A BETTER WAY

HON. ROBERT E. BAUMAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. BAUMAN. Mr. Speaker, Thomas Jefferson had a healthy respect for the

good commonsense of rural Americans, which I certainly share with him. An example of this commonsense is contained in a recent editorial from the Kent County News in my district which comments on the pitfalls of socialized medicine and Government interference in the medical profession. The editor of the News correctly concludes that a takeover from Washington of our health care is not the answer.

I insert, at this point, the editorial from the Kent County News:

A BETTER WAY

Americans are a notably independent people. Oddly, in all the discussions of programs proposing compulsory government health insurance, very little is said about just how the nation's doctors, a highly individualistic group of citizens, are to be harnessed to the will of government. An inkling of what could happen has been revealed in a survey of almost 100,000 physicians by the American Medical Association.

The survey finds, according to The New York Times, that, "A majority of American doctors are disgruntled at Federal health programs and one third would boycott a nationalized health system if it were set up..." The survey showed that more than 35 percent of the doctors who responded said they would either refuse to practice in a nationalized health system or would leave the practice of medicine altogether if such a system were created.

Medical men, by tradition and training, are a dedicated group of individuals. Within our voluntary, pluralistic health care system, their sense of duty leads them into working man-killing schedules. Their devotion to the highest standards of medical skills and to the cause of healing the ill is legendary, but the notion that they would accept compulsion is presumptuous, to say the least. Why should a doctor, who has spent a good portion of his life and a veritable fortune acquiring the knowledge and the skills of his profession, be expected to bow to the dictates of government bureaus and bureaucrats? It just doesn't make sense. And that is why the shadow of nationalized medicine that has been held over doctors for so many years has been called an "Insidious Threat" to the quality of medical care.

There is a better way to assure continued medical progress and that is through programs, government or otherwise, that seek to build on the merits of the existing system—a system that has brought unparalleled advances in the medical arts.

THE REAL TRAGEDY OF WATERGATE

HON. FRED B. ROONEY

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, for more than a year a seemingly endless chain of disclosures of illegal acts, dirty tricks, efforts to obstruct justice, abuse and misuse of campaign contributions, and much more involving men at the very highest levels of our National Government has slowly but surely eroded the confidence of many Americans in their Government.

They question not only the competence and integrity of leadership but they question, too, the apparent total disregard for law, order, and justice by so many who wielded ominous power and

authority in elective and appointive offices.

I sincerely hope, Mr. Speaker, that none of us in the Congress will grow complacent or apathetic toward the need for totally independent investigation and vigorous prosecution of illegal acts involved in this whole sordid affair. Each one of us should not only be deeply concerned, we should be earnestly alarmed by the terrible impact events of the past several years are having upon our citizens.

At no time has this been made more apparent to me than in a letter I received recently from an elderly, retired gentleman, living on his social security income, agonizing over demands upon his own limited resources as well as the current state of morality and integrity among leaders of his Nation.

He wrote, in part:

I bought a used car about 1 year ago which the garage man told me the second time he worked on it, "get rid of it, it is a lemon." I had it out to (dealer's name omitted) who sold it to me and all they did was put a can of oil sealer in it while it was under guarantee.

I spent over \$200 on this car before I ever had 300 miles on it, now it is rusting away like hell. My garage man told me about 3 months after I bought it that it needed a motor overhaul, cost \$225 more.

(Dealer's name omitted) is in your district, Fogelsville, Pa. Now this is the stupid part of this letter. The way things are going on in this country, I feel like beating the hell out of him and then committing a lesser crime also. Could I get away with pleading guilty to the lesser crime and get the same sentence as Agnew?

I know this sounds silly but the way the country is going now, I am losing all my faith in our government.

He goes on to urge prompt impeachment of the President and then adds this postscript:

I was honest all my life but now I am changing views. I know this is a stupid letter but bear with it and please answer it. I always had faith in you.

Mr. Speaker, we must be concerned about this very real crisis of confidence—a loss of confidence in our national leadership, a loss of confidence in the fair and impartial dispensing of justice in America, a loss of confidence in our political institutions.

In my view, we in Congress simply cannot afford to tolerate any longer the attitudes, the activities, and the actions which have brought our Nation to this sorry state.

COMPUTER PROGRAM UTILIZING TRAINING AND EDUCATION, INC.

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of my colleagues the synopsis of a project which has been proposed for implementation in the Economic Development Administration's designated special impact area in Buffalo, N.Y. It is the brainchild of William Snyder, a well-known and respected Buf-

faloian, and the project would utilize the data processing industry to provide both training and employment to inner city residents.

If implemented, it would be a tremendous bolster to the tight job market which exists for unskilled and semi-skilled labor in the S.I.A. area. I therefore welcome the opportunity to share the following synopsis with my colleagues:

SYNOPSIS

Title: Computer Program Utilizing Training and Education, Inc., "Com-Pute." Location: In S.I.A., City of Buffalo. Cost Estimate: \$700,000. Description: This multi-purpose business development/training program developed for and located within the Greater Minority Community of Buffalo, New York as designated by the boundaries of the Buffalo Model Cities Agency and the Erie County Special Impact Area, will have short range and long range goals to be accomplished in the following manner: Short Range Goals: Will provide immediate employment and training for 10-15 unskilled semiskilled and skilled persons who will form the nucleus of the joint venture staff. Long Range Goals: Will ultimately be developed into an Electronic Data Processing School providing continuing education for "disadvantaged" persons in data processing and related skill areas.

Another goal will be the establishment of a supportive service bureau to sustain the educational/training program, by developing and marketing data processing services and related skills in allied areas, on a multi-dimensional level in time-sharing to commercial accounts, governmental (city and county), and social service related agencies, i.e., hospitals, schools, CAP organizations, etc. Assistance is needed to accomplish the final program development, staff training, and organization of equipment and materials, etc. Status of Plans: Proposal has been developed in detail. Effect on Employment: (Initially) Ten to fifteen persons will staff the project, with additional persons being trained and employed each year. Federal Aid Requests: \$200,000 in Technical Assistance Grants. \$365,000 in Business Loan Authorization. (9/14/72).

The preliminary research to the development of "Com-Pute" was based upon the simple premise that what was obviously a vital ingredient in the daily function of various disciplines within a majority society, must be assumed critical in its absence from a minority society.

Initial investigation consisted of conferences with marketing personnel, sales management, and various technicians within the Data Processing Industry.

Conclusions were that the Data Processing represented a twenty-first century science, the potential of this science was unlimited, that the career and employment opportunities exceed the cadre of properly trained personnel, that the salary and wage scale in all categories are excellent, that advancement opportunities are limited only to individual motivation, that the minority employee representation is grossly disproportionate to the majority, and that the existing educational opportunities for direct job entry training are nearly non-existent outside the industry.

It was concluded that the dynamics of this industry must be brought into the Greater Minority Community of Buffalo, New York, on a level and scale beyond mere token introduction.

With the exception of a demonstration project conducted in Buffalo in 1968 by the International Business Machine Corp., in cooperation with the Buffalo Board of Human Relations, there lacked any major attempt to seriously address the needs of the Minority Community, with those of the Data Processing Industry.

The key factor in the success or failure of a project of this nature is in the degree of Community Cooperation necessary to insure the availability of all of the relative information needed to properly program the computer to render a complete finding.

Cooperation on this level demands a complete response from all segments and all public service and political sub-divisions, regardless of affiliations, bearing in mind that the proposed model development is addressed to the entire population, recognizing that even certain adverse effects on one segment can and usually does indirectly effect all segments of the populace.

"Com-Pute" believes that if all of the existing evidence of the decline and slow regression of the Buffalo Metropolitan area can be honestly dealt with, as already suggested in the areas application for depressed area designation, then the project that "Com-Pute" hopes to render as a community service can not only succeed, but literally alter the course of the entire area.

In addition to the Market Feasibility study of the Metropolitan area to determine the immediate and long term business and labor Market demands in the area of data processing, computer program utilizing training and education inc., proposes to utilize our market research methodology, to conduct a program of broad research into the overall social/economic environments for the purpose of developing a computerized model city.

This computerized model would be constructed in three sub-divisions, comprised of those characteristics indigenous to a given sub-division where applicable, their respective inter-relationships, the characteristics common to the overall area, the common denominators and diagnosed effect on the area in both present and long term future.

The objective of this endeavor is two-fold. First its intention is to provide a supplement to the initial findings of the Greater Buffalo Development Foundations "Economic Prospects," attached to this proposal and secondly to hopefully provide a scientifically accurate prescription for the areas declining market that will be workable, and render an all out attack on the areas chronic unemployment, by properly identifying and focusing attention on those areas of the economy before they attain crisis status.

Aside from identifying future employment through computer projections, this project can serve as an ongoing strengthening factor to the entire metropolitan area. Additionally the model that is developed by "Com-Pute," can also be adjusted to meet the conditions of any other depressed area, once the basic model is determined and tested.

THE PRESERVATION OF PRIVACY

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, the highest governing body of the United Presbyterian Church, the General Assembly, met in May of this year for the 185th time. This body meets annually and is composed of representatives known as commissioners elected by the 166 presbyteries in all parts of the country. One half of the commissioners are ordained ministers and the other half are lay leaders of local churches known as ruling elders.

At the 185th General Assembly, the commissioners expressed their conviction that the right of privacy must be developed in American law at a pace commensurate with available technology

and organizational practice. To help reach these ends they adopted guidelines for the preservation of privacy.

Privacy is a personal freedom that allows one to live without interference from others. With privacy one has the liberty to control what others may know about oneself. Privacy is the fundamental right to be left alone from harassment by others or to join with others without being watched. The possession of privacy is the ability to choose how and when information about oneself is collected and shared. Privacy is increasingly threatened by the great amount of computer stored information readily available on each individual in our society.

These guidelines of the 185th General Assembly of the United Presbyterian Church have no real meaning unless they are implemented. I now submit these guidelines for the attention of my colleagues with the hope that this legislative body will join with the United Presbyterian Church in seeking a way to safeguard this basic right:

GUIDELINES FOR THE PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

We call upon public and private agencies to provide for maximum protection of privacy in their dealings and transactions with each other and with individuals; and through self-regulation to meet at least these minimum guidelines for the collection, retention, and dissemination of personal data:

1. Determine beforehand whether the information to be gathered is necessary and relevant to the purpose for which it is sought, so as to minimize the amount of unduly personal, potentially injurious material that is collected and preserved.

2. Limit information systems to specific uses and justify the objectives, methods, and effects of any collection of personal data.

3. Give the subject prompt notice and ready access to such information. (We recognize that certain government agencies collect information on criminal activities where notice and access are controlled by established rules of law and procedure.)

4. Provide means for rapid correction of erroneous data, and the opportunity to expunge irrelevant or obsolete recorded data, such opportunity to be available to both the custodian and the subject of the data.

5. Provide effective safeguards to prevent accidental or unauthorized interception, input, or destruction of data.

6. Require effective safeguards for waiver of privacy and authorization of access to personal data executed by individuals and given to business, professional, and governmental bodies.

7. Limit the use and transfer of information in such systems, and monitor their expansion into enlarged data-sharing operations.

RECOMMENDED POLICIES AND PROCEDURES TO IMPLEMENT THE GUIDELINES FOR THE PROTECTION OF PRIVACY

1. In credit and insurance reports, we favor messages that provide for the subject to add new information, to expunge obsolete data, or to explain any item in the files, and review the pertinency on privacy grounds of all types of information collected.

2. In bank and credit records, we call for regulations that require access only by customer authorization, subpoena after customer notification and opportunity to challenge, or by search warrant with inventory of information taken.

3. In welfare reform, we emphasize the need to: (a) examine the privacy impact of proposals for using social security numbers of registrants or for disseminating information on recipients, and (b) restrict the re-

cording and storage of personal information which adversely affects the privacy of the welfare client while a person not on public assistance could refuse to make such information public.

4. In law enforcement, we call for procedures at all levels of government to: (a) routinely expunge records of arrest where there is no conviction, and of juvenile proceedings when the juvenile reaches the age of majority, except where the court is shown "probable cause" for preserving the record, and (b) require judicial approval and supervision of the use of informers who establish or maintain a relationship for the purpose of informing in civil or criminal investigations.

5. In educational institutions, we favor measures to: (a) provide the student access to his or her personal records kept by the school, which are routinely made accessible to others, (b) provide safeguards to ensure that only authorized persons who have legitimate justification shall have access to those records, and (c) where applicable provide for the requirements specified in 4 above.

6. Regarding domestic security, we favor action to: (a) prohibit any branch of the Department of Defense from engaging in surveillance of, or data collection on, domestic political activity and (b) require the destruction of all such political surveillance files accumulated by the military.

7. As regards domestic surveillance by civil law enforcement agencies, we commend the efforts of the Committee on Public Justice to stimulate legislation creating citizens' committees to oversee such activity; and we urge that legitimate surveillance be precisely defined by law, that surveillance be administered by personnel under court supervision, and that severe criminal penalties be established for illegal surveillance.

8. Regarding confidential relationships, we urge: (a) enactment of uniform state legislation and consistent federal legislation to establish guidelines that protect legitimate news professionals from being compelled to testify about their sources; (b) development of legal guidelines for limiting the use on privacy grounds of subpoenas and immunity provisions in the conduct of grand juries, and (c) review of current statutes.

9. For the violation of these rights, as defined in this section, we recommend provisions be made for recovery of actual and punitive damages and for injunctive relief for threatened violations.

RECOMMENDATION FOR A NATIONAL PRIVACY SERVICE OFFICE

We call for the formation of a National Privacy Service Office which will provide, in the manner of an *ombudsman*,* services to citizens whose privacy is threatened by activities of federal governmental, commercial, or research agencies, and who cannot otherwise obtain relief using the ordinary remedies available to them by law, business custom, or agency practice.

1. The ombudsman would be an adjunct of the United States Courts and be accountable to the independent administrative branch of the federal judiciary.

2. The ombudsman would receive and investigate complaints by citizens and associations whose privacy is alleged to be threatened by activities of governmental and non-governmental entities identified above.

3. The ombudsman would, upon specific citizen or associational complaint and authorization to intercede, have power to compel disclosure of relevant records held by the agency or corporation, and in the case of a complaint directed against law enforcement officials conducting an ongoing criminal investigation, would be able to compel court examination of relevant documents.

4. When a complaint justifies intervention, the ombudsman would seek to resolve the dispute through mediation, public reporting,

or recommendation of administrative or judicial action.

5. A Privacy Service Office (*ombudsman*) of a similar nature should be provided at the state level to investigate citizen or associational complaints of threat to privacy by state or local public agencies (including educational institutions) or by business enterprises that are not otherwise subject to federal supervision or regulation.

RECOMMENDATION TO CREATE AN INDEPENDENT REGULATORY BODY

We recommend the creation of an independent regulatory body with carefully defined authority to review, oversee, and approve the collection and dissemination of personal data by governmental bodies or agencies and by entities that collect and disseminate personal data for public and commercial purposes.

Despite the fears and deficiencies which seem inherent in regulatory administrative bodies, we feel that such a regulatory agency offers the hope of flexibility and expertise to meet the threat of dehumanization in an area of rapidly developing technology. Because existing regulatory bodies at the federal and most state levels could not objectively regulate themselves and other governmental agencies, we therefore recommend:

1. There be created at both the state and federal level autonomous regulatory bodies with the authority to supervise the collection, storage, and dissemination of personal data by governmental agencies or bodies and by entities that collect and disseminate personal data for public and commercial purposes.

2. The legislation creating the regulatory body should be so drawn as to ensure the autonomy of the agency from those it seeks to regulate, and to ensure the participation of groups sensitive to privacy needs.

3. The legislation creating the regulatory body should mandate the adoption of regulations that would require compliance with the applicable minimum guidelines for the right of privacy as set out in the guidelines on page 5.

4. The regulatory agency should not have access to data contained in the information systems, except by random selection of information not keyed to personal identity and then only when necessary to effectuate adequate controls and enforcement.

5. The regulatory agency, in protecting privacy, need not and must not impair the free exercise of religion, speech, press, assembly, or petition, and the legislation creating it should make clear that it has no powers of censorship, sponsorship, or influence over the activities of citizens or associations exercising those freedoms.

POLICY STATEMENT ON THE PRESERVATION OF PRIVACY

The ability to maintain one's own life space is basic to human existence in vital community. Lively private associations provide room for a process of maturation through personal risk, sheltered experiment, and free exploration of ideas and lifestyles.

From a Christian theological perspective, it is especially important to be reticent about demanding or exposing another's record, and to respect each person's unique context. Christian faith stresses the dignity of persons and groups living by grace in a fallen world. We rejoice in forgiving God who in his mercy can decide to forget the past and to open the future to his creatures. His liberating grace empowers us to care all the more for individual and social freedom.

Privacy is freedom from interference, opportunity to grow, liberty to control what others may know about oneself. Privacy is the right to be left alone or to join others without being watched, as well as the ability

* *Ombudsman*: one who investigates reported complaints, reports findings, and helps to achieve equitable settlements.

to choose how and when information about oneself is collected and shared.

Increasingly, personal and associational privacy is undermined by the indiscriminate use of electronic and large manual systems of information collection and interchange. This happens in the process of making credit checks, in some census procedures, and in the misuse of other personal questionnaires. We find also that government agencies, at their own discretion and in secret, are obtaining access to bank accounts and other commercial records. Furthermore, the United States Army has violated privacy in the name of internal security by developing millions of dossiers on the personal and political activities of innocent civilians, including public officials who have been doing nothing more than exercising their guaranteed constitutional rights.

Meanwhile individuals and organizations being searched or watched have no effective access to the files that profile their activities, opinions, and beliefs.

If, as the 1972 General Conference of the United Methodist Church warned, such developments "are signs that the society which is democratic in theory and structure is becoming increasingly repressive in policy and practice," then it is imperative for citizens to reassert their liberty. In the effort to protect our privacy we should be concerned not only with the behavior of government agencies. Comprehensive information on many citizens is also gathered by and available to private investigative agencies, credit bureaus, and business organizations, which profit from the sale of personal data.

The right of privacy is implied, though not explicitly stated, in the Constitution of the United States. Its authors did not anticipate systems of microfilm, magnetic tape, data searches, centralized processing, time sharing, remote access, control programs, electronic eavesdropping. Apparently the Founding Fathers assumed privacy to be a natural foundation for other rights that were threatened in their time: freedom of expression and association, privilege against self-incrimination, due process of law, and freedom from unreasonable or warrantless search and seizure.

Today, in the light of our theological and legal heritage, privacy must be safeguarded more specifically. This right needs to be developed in American law at a pace commensurate with the potential invasions of privacy made possible by changing technology and organizational practice. Nothing less than the quality of freedom is at stake in the effort to preserve areas of personal and associational privacy.

EXPLANATION ON VOTE

HON. ELIZABETH HOLTZMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Ms. HOLTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to explain my absence for the vote on House Resolution 687, the rule providing for consideration of H.R. 11104, the public debt limit increase bill.

On November 7 when the vote on this rule was taken I was in a Judiciary Committee meeting reviewing materials in connection with that committee's confirmation of GERALD FORD. The bells do not ring in the committee room.

Had I been present for the vote, I would have voted "nay" since this rule did not permit consideration of a prompt social security increase or of tax reform. We should have considered these matters and approved them.

It is urgent that the Congress make our tax laws fairer and provide additional social security benefits for our senior citizens who are struggling desperately under our present inflation.

It is unfortunate that the attempt to defeat the rule lost by a substantial margin. Congress cannot bury its head in the sand on these problems much longer.

THE NEED TO EXAMINE ABORTION PROPOSALS

HON. ROBIN L. BEARD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. BEARD. Mr. Speaker, for millions of Americans the aftermath of the January 22 Supreme Court decision on abortion has been a distressing and difficult fact. Many believe that the Court's nullification of virtually all State and Federal laws on abortion and guarantee of an absolute right to abortion for any woman during the first trimester of pregnancy is wrong. As with other controversial rulings, the abortion decision has left opponents of abortion with a total sense of helplessness to cope with something they feel tantamount to murder.

No issue generates more emotion than abortion. No subject is more volatile than the discussion of abortion. No major issue has received less attention in the way of congressional consideration than abortion. In the past, most Members have felt that abortion should be left to the discretion of the States themselves and until January 22, such a position was entirely viable. But, with the interpretation by the Supreme Court, antiabortionist now believe that the only remaining remedy available to correct the situation is the route of amending the constitution or possibly removing court jurisdiction over the issue.

Despite the furor that has been raised across the country, Congress has so far decided not to inquire into the various ramifications of this historic decision. The appropriate standing committee in the House, to hear bills seeking to modify the court ruling has demonstrated an obvious reluctance toward formal consideration of the several proposals now outstanding. In fact, the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights of the Committee on Judiciary has formally rejected a motion to conduct public hearings on abortion. It is true that the House Judiciary has several extremely pressing items which have absorbed the full attention of the committee.

An alternative to normal legislative procedure has been offered by my distinguished colleague, Mr. HOGAN of Maryland—a discharge petition. Mr. HOGAN has filed such a petition to relieve the Judiciary Committee from jurisdiction over his proposed constitutional amendment, House joint resolution (H.J. Res. 261). Mr. HOGAN must be congratulated for the leadership he has shown in this matter. I, myself, have felt the need to resort to such an extreme measure when I filed discharge petition No. 1, to dis-

charge the committee from consideration of an antibusing constitutional amendment. From time to time such extreme measures are necessary when a small group attempts to thwart the Congress from working its will through deliberate action. However, several factors must first be considered. First, as I can well attest a discharge petition is a long and arduous procedure. Also, because the process that would bring the constitutional amendment to the floor prevents consideration of other remedial approaches that have been suggested, this course should be used only as a last resort. Second, unlike proposed busing amendments, Mr. HOGAN's proposal has not received an in-depth examination of its long range implications by any body of the Congress. Under the rules debate time and opportunities for amendment are extremely limited when a bill is discharged. The fear then, is that unless adequate groundwork for an amendment is laid, Congress may overlook some of the problems that could develop from the language of the proposal, thus, opening a new avenue for opposition.

Moreover, many Members believe that the constitutional amendment is not necessary. It is reasonable to contend that Congress may and should correct the court's decision through simple legislation. Mr. DENHOLM of South Dakota, has proposed in his bill, H.R. 7752 that we define the word "person" to include "any animate combination of viable human cells capable of becoming or being an actual independent living human—singular or plural—entity."

Mr. FROELICH, of Wisconsin, has suggested another approach in his bill, H.R. 8682 wherein he states that Congress should exercise the power the Constitution has given in section 5 of the 14th amendment to limit the scope of that amendment in relation to abortion. His proposal provides: Nothing in the 14th article of the amendment to the Constitution of the United States shall be construed to bar any State from exercising power to regulate or prohibit practice of abortion except that no State may prohibit an abortion that is necessary to save the life of a pregnant woman.

Many Members are supporting constitutional amendments.

Mr. HOGAN's amendment, House Joint Resolution 261 provides, in part:

Neither the United States nor any State shall deprive any human being from the moment of conception of life without due process of law; nor deny to any human being, from the moment of conception, within its jurisdiction, the equal protection of the laws.

Senator BUCKLEY, of New York, has proposed an amendment, Senate Joint Resolution 119, which follows in part:

With respect to the right to life, the word person, as used in this article and in the 5th and 14th Articles of the amendment to the Constitution of the United States, applies to all human beings, including the unborn offspring at every stage of their biological development, irrespective of age, health, function, or condition of dependency.

Mr. WHITEHURST, of Virginia, has introduced an amendment, House Joint Resolution 426, as follows:

Nothing in this Constitution shall bar any state or territory or the District of Columbia, with regard to any area over which it

has jurisdiction, from allowing, regulating, or prohibiting the practice of abortion.

Recently, yet another proposal has been offered to address the problem of Judiciary Committee inaction on abortion: the creation of a special committee. I believe that, if the standing committee gives no indication of ability or inclination to act on the various proposals referred to it, then, we should perhaps establish such a select committee. The approach has been jointly offered by my colleagues, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. KEATING and Mr. RONCALLO of New York. The resolution, House Resolution 585, would create a select committee to study the impact and ramifications of the Supreme Court's decision on abortion. Mr. FROELICH has introduced this resolution because of the imperative need for Congress to hold hearings on the transcendent issue of public policy that flow from the Supreme Court's unprecedented decision last January.

All these proposals deserve consideration. Yet, no action can occur until leadership of the appropriate House and Senate committees decide to take action.

Until hearings are held to examine the best way to handle the question, many people throughout the country will feel that they have no voice here in Washington; that their very legitimate concerns are not being heard, and worse, that for them, there is no representation. Of these, I feel that the latter is most devastating. Too many Americans have become resigned to the belief that their small voices will not be heard and that their views are not being represented. This body should be responsive. It should investigate the implications of the policy decisions established by its sister, the judicial branch, especially in the supercharged case of abortion. I hope and pray that Congress accepts this responsibility and will do so without further delay.

THE LATE HONORABLE ROBERT EWING THOMASON

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 12, 1973

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the recent passing of my good and longtime friend, Judge Robert Ewing Thomason of El Paso, Tex., is a great loss to me personally as well as to the other Members of this body who knew him during his long tenure in the House.

Ewing Thomason was an extraordinary man who applied his great and varied talents to the service of his city, State, and country in a variety of important and difficult posts. He served the city of El Paso as a State representative and later as its mayor. While in the State legislature he served as Speaker of the Texas House of Representatives and in 1930 he was elected to serve in this body as a Representative from Texas. He served eight terms here before President Truman in 1947 appointed him as a

Federal judge for the western district of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, it was my distinct pleasure and honor to have served with and to have learned much from Ewing when I first came to this distinguished body for I served under him on the former House Military Affairs Committee. His leadership as vice chairman during the war years was truly outstanding for he personally coauthored all of the major legislation necessary for the successful pursuit of the war and ultimate victory.

His contributions to his country continued after leaving the House as he became one of the most respected and revered judges in the Federal judicial system.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the memory of Judge Ewing Thomason will be cherished by all those who knew him and that my sense of personal loss is shared by many both in this Chamber and out.

To Mrs. Thomason and the Thomason family I extend the Rooney's deepest sympathy and prayers in this time of great loss and bereavement.

BROWNSVILLE SOLDIERS RECEIVE ANOTHER PAYMENT TOWARD JUSTICE

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the passage of H.R. 9474 today by the House brings near to completion the rendering of justice—after 67 long years—to those of the survivors of the Brownsville incident of August 13, 1906.

When this bill is accepted by the Senate and signed into law by the President, it will by no means do all that should be done to compensate the 167 black Brownsville soldiers who have been suffering so much along with their families, from the false charges that were brought against them and from the denial of their rights to due process to be heard in their own defense.

The bill provides \$25,000 for any veteran who was dishonorably discharged from the U.S. Army as the result of the Brownsville incident, and \$10,000 for any unremarried widow of any veteran upon application made to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs.

When President Theodore Roosevelt decided without any pretense of a trial that they were guilty and when they were drummed out of the Army that they had so faithfully served in the Cuban and Philippines campaigns, their names were written in near indelible disgrace in the annals of our Nation. Our action today changes all that.

After having this matter called to my attention through John D. Weaver's book "The Brownsville Raid: The Story of America's Black Dreyfus Affair," W. W. Norton and Co.—hardback and paperback—1970, I began efforts to right this

wrong. Fortunately, the Secretary of the Army, Mr. Robert Froehke, soon issued an order changing the discharges of the 167 men from "without honor" to "honorable." Then, joined by Senator HUMPHREY and Congressman FRASER, with the invaluable aid of Senator HARTKE, I introduced legislation that was designed to provide relief. The fruition of that effort is the provisions of the present act.

I think that the passage of this legislation shows clearly that justice can be done—at least in substantial measure—in spite of the passage of time and changing of events. The correction of this historical wrong is strongly to the credit of the Congress and of the Government of the Nation. And if we have set a little precedent, it has been that justice might be done.

SIXTY YEARS OF THE INCOME TAX

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, certain national publications have taken note among their reports on the monumental news developments of recent weeks that this autumn season happens to mark the 60th birthday of the Federal income tax on American individuals.

In their anniversary stories, the publications dutifully record that the present levy is the third income tax in our history, that the previous two were withdrawn after congressional and court battles, and that the predictions made for the present one by its advocates back in 1913 were pitifully inaccurate.

The Wall Street Journal recalls, for example, the "outrage" of Senator William E. Borah, of Idaho, at suggestions that the tax rate might climb "as high as 20 percent," a caveat sounded by the tax foes of that era. The Journal adds:

Who, he (Borah) asked, could impose such socialistic, confiscatory rates? Only Congress. And how could Congress—the representatives of the people—be so lacking in fairness, justice and patriotism?

Senator Borah, obviously, was a naive and trusting man. If around today, he would have his answer. Where the 1913 levy hit, in a very slight way, one out of every 271 Americans, today's levy is paid by approximately a third of our people. Collections in the first year of application amounted to about \$35 million. Last year's total reached \$94 billion.

Thus, on this anniversary, we can look back over the years and see how fooled were those original income taxers and, also, how this levy, so innocently imposed as a "soak the rich" measure, has become a matter affecting the lives of all of us, and a burden unprecedented in size and consequence.

But more significant, perhaps, is the realization now of what this tax has meant in the shaping of events of the last six decades. I might ask, Mr. Speaker, if our entrance into World War I, and the major role we came to play in its

windup, would have been possible had our "jungoists" of that era been faced with the problem of finding the means of financing it? The new income tax was their ready instrument. And its rates were lifted to provide the money needed.

What, if we had kept out of that conflict and let the European powers, exhausted and their armies locked in their trenches, negotiate by necessity a mutually equitable peace? The chances are that Europe would have achieved a stable way of life instead of the subsequent turmoil, that World War II would not have occurred, and that we would have escaped the age of depression and wars which has been our lot.

The income tax—the easiest kind for Government to collect—can be largely blamed for our international misadventures and, indirectly, those of much of the world. Could we have done all the damaging things we did if it had been necessary to induce our people to accept special taxes to pay for them? Of course not. But the ready income tax, so easy to adjust upwards, allowed free rein to our adventures. Imagine, if you can, the American people willingly coming up with the money to be tossed away all over the world in the foreign aid programs? Or to finance that miserable war in Vietnam?

The income tax and the 1943 decision by Congress to withhold it at its source have been the underlying forces in much that we have done as a nation since 1913. They have created the big government evil which many now recognize and fear that nothing can be done about. They have wasted our people's resources and lessened their own freedoms and initiatives. They have threatened this country with the socialism which Senator Borah in 1913 thought too impossible to contemplate.

What, then, on this tax anniversary, should be our resolve? To get rid of it? This is an unreasonable thought now. It could not be done without collapsing both the Government and the economy generally. Reduce its rates? Commendable as may be the idea, even this would be dangerous without great care and adjustment to say nothing of a full willingness to cut Federal spending deeply. The fact is that we are the captives of the tax and no longer its masters, a situation which Senator Borah and his income levy associates of 1913 could not have foreseen, faithful as they were to a belief that future Congresses would be moderate.

But there is one thing, Mr. Speaker, on which we can make up our minds today. We can determine that, hard as is this tax now on our people, we will never agree to make it worse. We hear much talk these days of increasing taxes for one reason or another. The Nixon administration has become adept at running up trial balloons on the subject. Federal policymakers and bureaucrats discuss tax boosts as panacea for most every problem they face. Well, on this 60th anniversary of the income levy, let us give them notice that the limit has been reached, that under no circumstances, save for the survival of the Nation itself, will we vote to take more from the earnings of Americans.

IN THANKSGIVING OUR NATION
SALUTES THE PILGRIMAGE TO
OUR NATION'S CAPITAL OF THE
CATHOLIC DIOCESE OF PATER-
SON, N.J.

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker. As we prepare for this year's Thanksgiving holiday, it is my honor and privilege to call to the attention of your and our colleagues a recent pilgrimage to the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception which, in my judgment, serves as an inspiration to all of us in recalling the historic pilgrimage that memorializes Thanksgiving Day as a national day of remembrance in America and leaves no doubt that the faith, courage, and perseverance inherent in the original settlers of our land is still infused in the hearts and minds of the families of today's society where man's religious beliefs and aspirations tend to seem obscured by the modern and so-called sophisticated world of time and space.

On Saturday, September 15, over 2,100 members of the Catholic Diocese of Paterson, N.J., participated in a pilgrimage to our Nation's Capital under the leadership of the Most Reverend Bishop Lawrence B. Casey, who was the principal celebrant of Mass at the National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception assisted by 26 prelates and priests as cocongregants.

Prior to the celebration of this Mass, prayers and mass were offered in the many chapels of the National Shrine where people of all national heritages including the Irish, Germans, Polish, Lithuanian, Ukrainian, Slovak, Croatian, Hungarian, Ruthenian, Czechoslovakian, and Italian, have contributed to the beauty and magnificence of this architecturally well-designed edifice of national and international renown. The Knights of Columbus look proudly to the great tower which was erected by their generosity.

The Most Reverend Bishop Casey appointed Father John J. Demkovich, pastor of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Slovak Church of Passaic, N.J., as coordinator of this pilgrimage and praised the young zealous priest for the "outstanding job" he performed.

The pilgrimage was reported in many publications throughout the diocese of Paterson and, Mr. Speaker, I respectfully request permission to insert at this point in our historic journal of Congress the following report published in the September 1973 issue of "Children's Friend" (Priatel Dietok), junior publication of New Jersey's highly prestigious Slovak news publication, Slovak Catholic Sokol (Falcon) of Passaic, N.J., by its most distinguished editor, the Honorable John C. Sciranka, who also participated in the pilgrimage:

NATIONAL SHRINE OF IMMACULATE CONCEPTION IN WASHINGTON, D.C., IS A PRIDE OF AMERICAN CATHOLICS

On Saturday, September 15, 1973 the Paterson, N.J., Diocese held its Pilgrimage to the National Shrine of the Immaculate Con-

ception in Washington, D.C. The Most Rev. Lawrence B. Casey, Bishop of Paterson Diocese, who led the pilgrimage, appointed Father John J. Demkovich, pastor of St. Mary's Roman Catholic Slovak Church of Passaic, N.J., as coordinator of the pilgrimage. Many of our Sokols and Sokolky, including our Editor, took part in this large pilgrimage and paid a special tribute to the Mother of Sorrows, patroness of Slovakia in a beautiful Slovak Chapel, which was also visited by Bishop Casey and Msgr. John J. Murphy, new Director of the Shrine. Prayers were recited in unison in Slovak and a popular Marian Slovak hymn "Pred vekmi zvolená Pani Anjelská" was sung, led by our editor.

The Slovaks of Washington presented a beautiful basket of red roses before the statue of Pieta, which attracted many visitors and they paused—to say a prayer. It was the feast of the Sorrowful Mother, when the tenth anniversary of the dedication of the Slovak Institute of SS. Cyril and Methodius was celebrated in Rome, with some 50 American Slovak leaders in attendance, headed by the Most Rev. Andrew G. Grutka, Bishop of Gary, Indiana and Msgr. Joseph S. Altany, honorary President of the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

The National Shrine of the Immaculate Conception is the largest Catholic church in the United States and the seventh largest church in the world. The Shrine is impressive chiefly because of its beauty. While massive and majestic, still with its slender Tower and perfectly poised Dome, it is graceful.

Built as were medieval cathedrals, without any steel skeleton, or framework, the Shrine is fashioned entirely of stone, brick, tile and concrete. Its construction was a blending of ancient technique and modern devices; a blending of Byzantine, Romanesque and contemporary styles. With its strong classical influence, the Shrine harmonizes perfectly with the other architectural landmarks of the city of Washington. The Shrine is built in the form of a Latin cross. Its peaked roof covers six of the seven interior domes.

On the outside walls of the Shrine there are many separate pieces of sculpture, a permanent museum of some of the best work of great American artists. A special committee of artists, theologians, and scripture scholars arranged the sculpture, symbols and quotations so that they are accurate and fixed in meaningful patterns.

One of the glorious facts about the Shrine is that it has been made possible by all the Catholic people of the United States. Under the inspiration and guidance of their bishops, the Catholic people in every diocese in the United States have contributed to the erection of the Shrine. The Shrine has been built through "small" donations. Every bishop, every diocese, all the priests, religious, faithful of the country, have made sacrifices for the Shrine. The Shrine is truly national. It truly speaks of the love of all the American Catholics for Mary.

Besides the beautiful Slovak Chapel of the Mother of Sorrows, patroness of Slovakia, donated by the Jednota Slovak fraternal organization, on the exterior of the Shrine among the many statues, are also statues of SS. Cyril and Methodius, next to St. Patrick and St. Boniface, donated by the Slovak Catholic Federation of America.

And in the crypt you will find on the wall the inscription of our Slovak Catholic Sokol organization.

Make, therefore, a special effort to visit this National Shrine and also the beautiful Slovak Chapel and you will have the most pleasant memories for the lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to present this statement to you and know you will want to join with me now in extending our heartiest congratulations and best wishes to the Most

Reverend Bishop Casey and all of the priests and members of the Diocese of Paterson who participated in this pilgrimage on their standards of excellence and the exemplary contribution they are making to the quality of the way of life in our community, State, and Nation. May we take a moment of silent prayer in thanksgiving to them and all of our people throughout America.

CRIME CONTROL NO. 9

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, it is one of the paradoxes of liberalism that it simultaneously professes fear of governmental power and advocates the increase of governmental power. To give an example, many liberals are considering impeachment of the President and simultaneously urging that the President be granted extraordinary powers to deal with the most recent crisis.

One might be led to conclude that liberalism is schizophrenic, but such a conclusion would be inaccurate: Liberal opposition to the growth of government is pure rhetoric, as illustrated by the liberal position on gun control. What the liberals fear is privately owned guns—not guns owned by the Government. The liberal position on privately owned guns is entirely consistent with the liberal position on all private property: there shouldn't be any; all property should be controlled, regulated, or confiscated by the omnipotent state. The liberals have no objection to guns—only to guns they do not control. They are seeking a legal monopoly on guns—at this point handguns—in order to eliminate any final opposition to a socialist government. This is the purpose of the gun control lobby—not the reduction of crime, which could easily be achieved by harsher penalties for criminals—but the elimination of citizen opposition to their socialist plans.

When those citizens who own guns awaken to the fact that their guns are the target of the expropriators for the same reason that all their property is the target of the statist, then private gun ownership will be defended as it should be defended—as the right to private property. And when private gun owners understand that their guns have been singled out for confiscation because private ownership of guns constitutes the only remaining effective check against an unconstitutional and dictatorial usurpation of power, then they will understand the motive of the gun control lobbyists. It was Chairman Mao Tse-tung who said, "Power flows out of the barrel of a gun." The liberals, as much as I, accept that proposition as true.

It is because they wish to see a concentration of power in government that they advocate confiscation of guns; it is because I oppose concentration of power in government that I oppose the gun control lobby.

GET OFF HIS BACK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Lyn Daunoras, one of my most outstanding constituents and the feature editor of the Brookfield-Summit Valley Times, has a regular widely read column, "Lyn's Lines," which has made her a well-respected columnist in the Chicago and suburban press.

In her column of November 7, Lyn discusses the public furor surrounding the President's actions. I think that the Members will benefit from Lyn's emphatic point of view.

The article follows:

GET OFF HIS BACK!

(By Lyn Daunoras)

The best part about being an independent voter is that you can view both sides of a controversy somewhat objectively and not get as heated and excited as a partisan follower.

As the great hue and cry arose to "impeach Nixon," we were reminded of the morbid crowd that gathers when a man stands precariously on a ledge in a suicide threat. There are some who callously egg him on to jump and some who shrug the tragic scene off as not concerning them.

Diehard Republicans took their stand behind the president and many independents and Democrats were out for his scalp, particularly those who had voted Republican for the first time and now felt frustrated by what they considered an outright betrayal of their trust.

In that weekend of firings and resignations, we felt for the first time some genuine anger and certainly disappointment and shock, but it all fell short of impeachment.

Take the arguments: "The president refused to give up the tapes." Not knowing what the tapes contained, outsiders could hardly judge whether or not they would indeed be a blow to national security as Nixon deemed. You don't impeach a man for using his judgment in such a decision.

"The president placed himself above the law by refusing to give up the tapes to Judge Sirica after it was ruled he must do so." Not really. He did not refuse to give them up, he proposed an alternative by asking that a senator go over them instead of the judge. You don't impeach a man for coming up with a substitute plan, particularly when he had five days in which to comply with the ruling.

Further, two Watergate committee members, including the chairman, had approved the alternative. Archibald Cox did not. But was it up to Mr. Cox to disapprove? Wouldn't it be up to Judge Sirica to decide whether the alternative was acceptable to the court since it was his original compromise?

To top it off, Cox held a press conference in which he blasted the president's proposal, an action nobody has questioned, but we do. What executive, of country or company, would not fire a subordinate who openly criticized his boss without at least awaiting the official ruling of his idea? The most that can be said is that the president reneged on his promise to give Cox complete independence, but you don't impeach a man for breaking his promise (if we did, public officials would be impeached every day!)

His attitude about the press may be paranoiac but, in spite of his petulance, it is to some extent justifiable. He entered the room smiling and cordial and was greeted with frozen masks. Some of the questions were

sarcastic and from unquestionably hostile, rather than objective, reporters.

But the measure of a man is how he withstands disapproval. While saying that "the tougher it gets, the cooler I get," he proceeded to blow that cool after uttering some statements that were unwise and unbecoming... but human. We never knew that the press was beyond reproach. Still, you don't impeach a man for his opinion of the news media.

It has gone out of control on every side with the newspapers and TV commentators, stung by the criticism, showing their "fairness and understanding" by now demanding resignation rather than impeachment (probably realizing that chances of impeachment are slim) and dragging public opinion with them.

A lame duck president in these turbulent times is not an attractive prospect, but it just might help if everyone got off his back and remembered that one year ago today he won the biggest mandate ever received by any man. Critics provide the pressure, then wonder if he "can take it."

What has happened is that the news media, not hysterical at the time he said but hysterical since then, and all the current multi-investigations have so affected the voters that they no longer trust any public official. America is in an ugly mood with the whole country a massive hanging jury, ready to pronounce guilt before all the facts and evidence are in.

It is this kind of atmosphere that allows a radical group to run for office under the guise of "reform," present programs that sound good to the beaten ears of the voter, weary of controversy, and take over the reins of a promised "new government."

Only there would be no room for impeachment... and no freedom to suggest resignation... under that new government.

CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the Select Subcommittee on Education has recently held hearings on legislation that could have a significant impact on the well-being of our children. Although there have been efforts on the local level to deal with the problem of child abuse, a national commitment has been lacking. The legislation which the subcommittee is considering represents a concerted effort by Congress to coordinate programs to identify, prevent, and treat the problem.

I am a cosponsor of H.R. 6379, the Child Development and Abuse Prevention Act, one of the bills being considered. One of my colleagues from Massachusetts, MIKE HARRINGTON, is cosponsor of a comparable bill. He is recognized as a leader in the House in the area of children's legislation, and I would, therefore, like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of his statement submitted to the subcommittee concerning child abuse.

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON BEFORE THE SELECT SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR IN SUPPORT OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT LEGISLATION

Mr. Chairman. Thank you for the opportunity to present my views on legislation to

provide financial assistance for identification, prevention, and treatment relating to child abuse.

I think we all realize that our nation's future depends on the well-being of our children. Many of them, however, are faced with situations in their childhood restricting, or even precluding their development into what we usually regard as full maturity. Too many are poor, too many are malnourished, too many have physical and emotional problems, and too many cannot read. There are many factors which we recognize as contributing to these deficiencies. Although we usually cite economic and biological factors, there are others that must not be overlooked.

Child abuse is one such factor that has been with us a long time, but one which has received minimal effort to alleviate nationally. Although programs exist at state and local levels, most lack adequate funding and few provide followup and treatment once a case of child abuse has been reported. Further, HEW, which does not have even one employee working on the problem of child abuse full time, has admitted that it has no information about the effectiveness of state programs that receive funds under Title IV-B of the Social Security Act for such purposes.

I need not cite statistics, for they are either lacking or grossly inflated. Too often, we only hear about abuse when it has resulted in severe injury or death. One statistic I would like to cite, however, is that 90 percent of the parents involved can be rehabilitated, according to the American Academy of Pediatrics and others who recently testified before a Senate Subcommittee. Although much abuse is caused by psychotic or mentally ill adults, most cases are committed by frustrated parents who take their problems out on their children.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that our effort here must be to define the issues and prescribe remedial legislation which would fund programs to provide therapy to those parents who constitute this 90 percent. I am a cosponsor of H.R. 6483 (identical to H.R. 5914, the National Child Abuse Prevention Act), which seeks to accomplish this. The Subcommittee is considering several comparable bills and I wish to play no favorites. I only urge that this Subcommittee report a comprehensive bill that makes a realistic attempt to alleviate one of the many problems facing our future leaders.

COMMENDING YOUNG REPUBLICAN NATIONAL FEDERATION'S PLATFORM, 1973

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 7, 1973

Mr. ROUSSELOT. Mr. Speaker, I should like to commend to all of our colleagues a forthright statement of political principles—the Young Republican National Federation platform for 1973.

These young men and women can be proud of this declaration of ideals and expression of faith in America. I hope that the elder leaders of our party have as much confidence in the basic principle of individual freedom as these young leaders have so amply demonstrated. I, for one, look forward to the time when some of the members of the executive committee of the Young Republican National Federation will assume their leadership rolls in our party, and in our Na-

tional Government, because, on the basis of the pronouncements they have made in their 1973 platform, I feel that they have a valuable contribution to make.

I was especially happy, Mr. Speaker, to see that the Young Republicans believe, as I do, that we should maintain a strong national defense and that we should work to preserve a constitutional free-market economy. To that end, they recommend that—

First, the fiat money of today should be replaced by an inflation-free dollar backed by gold;

Second, taxes should be reduced through the abolition of the practice of withholding taxes;

Third, the personal graduated income tax should be abolished; and

Fourth, we must move toward reduction of our national debt. A first step should be the selling of those Government-owned businesses that are unconstitutionally run in direct competition with other free enterprise businesses. In itself this would net our Government \$65 billion and mean a 14-percent decrease in that debt.

The above points were taken from the 1973 Young Republican National Federation platform.

If these steps were taken, Mr. Speaker, I sincerely believe that the United States would be a far stronger and freer Nation. A few years from now, under the leadership of these dedicated young men and women, I am sure this will come to pass.

TO SAVE FUEL WE MUST SAVE MASS TRANSIT FARES

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, today I have introduced the Emergency Mass Transportation Fuel Conservation Act (H.R. 11478). This legislation will place a ceiling on mass transit fares throughout the Nation for the duration of the fuel shortage.

Increased public use of mass transportation is essential to effective fuel conservation. However, as fuel costs increase it is likely that public and private mass transportation agencies will be hard pressed to maintain their current fares. We must take care to remember that as mass transportation fares increase public and private mass transit ridership decreases.

I find it ironic that President Nixon should appeal to the American people and Congress to take action on the fuel shortages we face without adequately addressing himself to the needs of mass transit. The two problem areas are intimately related. If we are to save fuel, we must take steps to prevent further decline in the use of mass transit facilities. If we allow fares to skyrocket, as is being threatened in New York City and elsewhere, additional people will use automobiles, defeating attempts to save fuel,

and at the same time, increasing pollution levels.

In order to encourage people to make use of mass transportation and to prevent declines in mass transit ridership during the period of possible fuel shortages, the Emergency Mass Transportation Fuel Conservation Act will prohibit fare increases in the Nation's mass transit systems, both publicly and privately owned, because "increased public use of mass transportation is essential to effective fuel conservation."

The legislation requires the Federal Government to provide mass transit systems with enough funds to make up any operating deficits incurred because of the fare ceiling and increased costs. H.R. 11478 would also mandate an allocation system to insure that mass transit systems receive fuel on a priority basis.

I urge my colleagues to give this measure their most careful attention, and I particularly recommend it to members of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce as they consider emergency legislation regarding the fuel situation:

The text of the bill follows:

H.R. 11478

A bill to authorize and direct the President to develop and implement certain federally sponsored incentives relating to mass transportation.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Emergency Mass Transportation Fuel Conservation Act".

Sec. 2. The Congress hereby determines that—

(1) shortages of crude oil, residual fuel oil, and refined petroleum products caused by inadequate domestic production, environmental constraints, and the unavailability of imports sufficient to satisfy domestic demand, now exist;

(2) such shortages have created or will create severe economic dislocations and hardships, including loss of jobs, closing of factories and businesses, reduction of crop plantings and harvesting, and curtailment of vital public services, including the transportation of food and other essential goods;

(3) such hardships and dislocations jeopardize the normal flow of commerce and constitute a critical national energy crisis which is a threat to the public health, safety, and welfare and can be averted or minimized most efficiently and effectively through prompt action by the executive branch of Government;

(4) increased public use of mass transportation is essential to effective fuel conservation; and

(5) public and private mass transportation ridership decreases as mass transportation fares increase.

Sec. 3. Upon enactment of this Act the President shall develop and implement Federally sponsored incentives for the use of mass transportation, including—

(1) a prohibition on the increase of any fare for any public or private mass transportation system;

(2) Federal subsidies for additional expenses incurred due to increased services;

(3) priority rationing of fuel for mass transportation; and

(4) Federal subsidies for State and local public bodies and agencies and private mass transportation operating agencies to provide for the inability by any such body or agency to meet operating expenses incurred as a result of paragraphs (1), (2), and (3) of this section.

Sec. 4. For purposes of this Act, paragraph (3) of subsection (e) of section 142 of title 23, United States Code, is amended by striking out the period at the end of the paragraph and inserting in lieu thereof: "except that, with respect to the purchase of buses and rolling stock for fixed rail, the Federal share shall be 80 per centum."

Sec. 5. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this Act.

ROBERT THOMASON, 94, FORMER U.S. CONGRESSMAN, OF TEXAS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the November 11, 1973 Washington Star-News carried an article about the death of former U.S. Congressman Robert Thomason. Mr. Thomason finished out his years in Congress to become a Federal judge during my freshman year. I hope that each Member of Congress will take a moment to read the article in memory of a fine man who had an outstanding political career in various positions of government.

The article follows:

ROBERT THOMASON, 94, WAS FEDERAL JUDGE Retired U.S. District Judge Robert Ewing Thomason, 94, who also was a former Texas congressman, died Friday in El Paso. He had been ill for three months.

During a political career that spanned 60 years, Judge Thomason served as a Texas legislator, mayor of El Paso, U.S. Congressman and judge.

He was elected to the House of Representatives in 1931 and became the ranking member of the Military Affairs Committee in 1935.

President Harry S. Truman appointed him U.S. District judge for the Western District of Texas in 1947. He retired as a full-time judge in 1963 but occasionally heard cases until a few years ago.

In 1955, Judge Thomason declared that segregation in Texas schools was unconstitutional. It was the first such decision by a federal judge after the 1954 Supreme Court decision outlawing racial segregation in schools.

He was born in Shelbyville, Tenn., and received a B.S. degree from Southwestern University in Georgetown, Tex., in 1898. He received a law degree from the University of Texas in 1920 and first practiced law in Gainesville, Tex., where he served as district attorney from 1902 to 1906.

He moved to El Paso in 1912. Four years later he was elected to the Texas House of Representatives, where he served as speaker from 1919 to 1920. In 1920, he lost a bid for the governor's office.

He was mayor of El Paso from 1927 until his election to the House in 1931.

A SALUTE TO THE LATE LOU WILKE

HON. CLEM ROGERS McSPADDEN

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. McSPADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on October 22, 1973, an event occurred in

Bartlesville, Okla., which I believe needs national recognition. One of twelve men who were inducted into the Oklahoma Athletic Hall of Fame was the late Lou Wilke. No one served amateur athletics in general and basketball in particular better than did the late Lou Wilke.

During the depression years Mr. Wilke coached basketball at Phillips University, Enid, Okla., and later became a marketing executive for Phillips Petroleum Co., Bartlesville, Okla. As coach of the legendary Phillips Oilers Basketball team, he chalked up an unbelievable won-lost record of 98 wins against only 8 losses.

In 1948, Lou Wilke was named chairman of the U.S. Basketball Committee. In addition to twice being president of the AAU, Lou Wilke was a champion for athletics, a leader and a molder of men.

I join his countless friends, both in Oklahoma and over the Nation who knew him and respected him, in this great tribute.

IN DEFENSE OF NIXON

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, if one makes the mistake of only reading Washington newspapers and listening to biased newscasters on the three major networks, he gets the impression that President Nixon has virtually no support and that most of the Nation favors his immediate impeachment and/or removal from office. I suppose it is natural for the national media to put the President in an unfavorable light at every opportunity since they so vigorously opposed his reelection last November.

Fortunately, Mr. Speaker, the American people have learned to see through biased reporting. I think this is the case today and that more and more Americans support their President than the national radio and television networks and newspapers care to admit.

A good friend of mine, Mr. Terry Everett, publishes two weekly newspapers—the *Enterpriser* and *Daleville Today*—in Enterprise and Daleville, Ala., respectively. On October 31, 1973, Mr. Everett ran front page editorials entitled "In Defense of Nixon" which I believe correctly expresses the sentiments of millions of Americans.

I am including that editorial and the letters in response to the editorial with my comments to help my colleagues in the Congress understand the thinking of "grass roots" America:

IN DEFENSE OF NIXON

(By Terry Everett)

Last week was somewhat of a disappointing week for me. The events of the last several weeks led me to take what may be an unpopular stand with many of my friends . . . that of defending the President of the United States.

Perhaps the firing of Archibald Cox was the straw that broke the camel's back for many of my friends. It was for my brother, who called me and angrily wished he didn't have

to listen to any more Watergate, Cox, Richardson, etc.

Later in the evening a friend approached me with the same general feelings. "I stuck with Nixon until this thing with Cox," he said. I pointed out I had thought Cox a poor choice to begin with and wasn't sorry to see him go. My friend used my words to prove his point. "If you say Nixon made a mistake to hire Cox, it still works out that he made a mistake," he said.

Which makes him human like the rest of us, I thought to myself.

I have resented for some time the treatment of the President by the national news media. Television is such an over-powering medium and too many people accept for gospel whatever newscasters such as Dan Rather happens to be saying at the moment. That Mr. Rather should be accepted at face value disturbs me as much as the mistakes of the Nixon Administration.

I believe it was Howard K. Smith, who about five years ago, wrote a scorching indictment of the hatred held by many newscasters toward Richard Nixon. The article was lengthy and went into detail to describe how these national newscasters went out of their way to make Richard Nixon look bad. The article was, to say the least, eye-opening. And the feelings of the news media haven't changed.

To give a few small examples: Dan Rather several weeks ago in one of CBS' panel discussions went on for several minutes on why Nixon should turn over the Watergate tapes. Rather allowed as how no one in the United States would be allowed to withhold information wanted by a court and certainly the President shouldn't be allowed on the grounds of privileged information. One member of the panel corrected Rather and pointed out there was such a thing as privileged information and that it was common between a lawyer and his client, a priest and his parishioners, a wife and her husband and newsmen have been talking about privileged information ever since I can remember.

Not much damage done? That's hardly the point. Either Rather didn't know what any high school student knew, or he had got carried away in his efforts to make the President look bad. If Rather truly didn't know . . . then he shouldn't be a newscaster. If he did indeed know (and I must suspect he did since CBS has raised such a can over protection of their news sources—privileged information), then how many other slight alterations of simple facts is Rather guilty of in an effort to make the President look bad. For that matter, how many alterations of facts is CBS, NBC and ABC guilty of?

Take if you will still another example which occurred Monday morning of this week. On the CBS morning news (if you want to call it a news show), Presidential speechwriter Patrick Buchanan allowed as how he felt that every effort should be made to break up the monopoly held by the three major networks. Now Buchanan, by my count, made it "perfectly clear" on two separate occasions that was HIS opinion and not that of the White House and/or the President. Later in the day on my car radio came the startling discovery by ABC . . . "White House Launches New Threats To The Media!"

Now I ask you . . . how in the world do you explain such things?

The examples are small, but the point remains: The national television networks will and do distort facts to fit their purposes. There are many other cases but space simply won't allow the room. As a matter of fact, there are several books either on the market or coming with just such a subject.

Often Nixon is made to look bad simply by who the networks choose to give air time to. Why in the world would a network give air time to kooks (one I can think of with the morals of an alley cat. Nope, most alley cats I've seen have better morals) who want

to call the President of the United States a murderer? That bogs my mind. To give air time to someone calling President Nixon, who in case anyone has forgotten ended the Vietnam war, a murderer is ridiculous.

Here the President was . . . pressured on the one side by those who wanted to take a couple of A-bombs and just blow the place off the map . . . on the other side by those who wanted to completely give in at even the expense of our POW's . . . and in the middle by those of us who just wanted out the quickest way possible without losing too much face.

Well, the President got us out and as far as I can determine, did it in such a way that it is no longer a subject of national concern. Now to put some nut (or enemy) on television to call Nixon a murderer is impossible for me to understand. If Nixon is a murderer, then so are Washington, Lincoln, Grant, Hoover, Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson. If Nixon is a murderer, then so is every American fighting man who ever fired a shot at an enemy in defense of America. The American fighting man has always been made up and will always be made of Middle America. Mainly, because there are so many of us. Now what you don't hear is the networks giving air time to someone calling Middle America murderers. That's because the networks are smart enough to realize that Middle America still runs the country (and also works for and spends most of the money that makes it possible for the networks to sell those \$250,000 a minute television commercials). Oh, they'll let someone get a shot at Middle America every so often or at the so-called "establishment" (I have never understood that word). But, by and large the networks realize the only way to control Middle America is by proper programming . . . allowing us to hear and see what they want us to hear and see and when they want us to see and hear it.

Still another case of who gets air time. Senators Ted Kennedy and Edmund Muskie have had a good deal of criticism for the President and every time Mr. Kennedy and Mr. Muskie want to open their mouths to impart their latest anti-Nixon feelings, the networks are right there to gobble it up. Now that has got to be a laugh. Here's Mr. Muskie, who broke down during the primaries (not the ballgame, friend, the tryouts) and here is Mr. Kennedy, who disappeared for seven (or was it 12?) hours after a midnight drive across a bridge which ended in the tragic death of a young woman, criticizing the President for his mistakes.

Come on, Mr. Rather, where were you when we really needed you?

I don't bring up Mr. Muskie's or Mr. Kennedy's personal tragedies to belittle either of them . . . only to make a point. Can you imagine how long either of them would have been able to function as President of the United States under the pressure Richard Nixon has been under during the last year?

Many of us feel we have had our hands burned by sticking with Ted Agnew and now hesitate to give the same support to the President.

It was easy with Mr. Agnew . . . he was supposedly removed of any wrongdoings and clear of Watergate . . . that made the choice easy. We could have our cake and eat it. The choice is no longer easy and many of us are having to think twice about something we shouldn't have to even think once about. The networks realize this and that's the way they like it.

We know from past experiences we'll get more letters disagreeing with this editorial than supporting it. Such is nearly always the case as most people who agree won't write a letter to the editor while those who are upset by what we've had to say will let us know. That's as it should be . . . or is it? Is it instead time to not take the easy way out . . . time to take a stand . . . time to say

if we're going to have honesty in government, let's also have it from the networks and other news media.

After all, there's been a standing committee in Congress for over three years wanting to impeach Nixon for one thing or the other. The only problem is that in this time, they still haven't found anything to impeach Nixon for.

It has been frustrating.

Another thing's frustrating, too. This morning I vowed not to turn on my television set for a full month. Then I happened to think... Monday night football. Oh, well. Given a choice, I'll take Howard Cosell's mouth to Dan Rather's any time.

LETTERS

ENTERPRISE, ALA.

Letter to the Editor:

I am happy to see that someone other than my wife and a few friends share my views regarding the obviously slanted and irresponsible news broadcasting being presented by the three major television networks. I read your editorial "In Defense of Nixon" and I would like to say that I am in complete agreement with you and would like to see you continue with a series of editorials on this subject.

I feel that the people need to be informed as to how they are being programmed by these irresponsible giants of the news media.

I applaud your courage and support your effort.

Respectfully yours,

GERALD W. WILCOX, A.I.A.

DALEVILLE, ALA.

Letter to the Editor:

Several days ago I saw something in the *Enterprise* I appreciated very much. It was from an intelligent person who "Keeps Up". I wish more people would come out for our President publicly so that we people who don't read very much could better understand the situation. Several weeks ago I took a poll of downtown businessmen. Each one is backing our President. Then I had the nerve to write to the President. I told him about the poll and said in my letter we don't like you—we love you.

In less than two weeks I had a letter of thanks and appreciation. Of course his secretary typed it but it was the President's signature. One more thing. I dare Congressman Dickinson to go back on our President. If he does, I will never vote for him again.

CAROL THOMPSON.

ENTERPRISE, ALA.

Letter to the Editor:

As stated in your editorial of Oct. 13, 1973, "In Defense of Nixon" people usually do not respond unless they disagree or are angry. This response is in complete and total agreement with this article. I write to you in hopes that it will give you moral support to continue honest and objective reporting.

I am 71 years of age and have seen many trends in politics. Whether or not the news media is aware of the fact that their slanted, biased and deliberate dishonesty in reporting the news has done more to undermine our present system of Government than all the totalitarian governments have done during the entire history of this nation is very debatable. Surely the network's motives should be questioned.

It would be naive to expect any completely, totally honest and God-fearing person to ever achieve high public office. Therefore, I do not bestow any sainthood upon Mr. Nixon, but if you compare him with the Muskies; the McGovern's; the Humphreys; the Philip Harts and two-thirds of the Watergate panel, you would have to put a halo upon his head. Also Mr. A. Cox and his staff of Kennedysites have shown their real true colors "leaking innuendos, half truths, and deliberate lies

to the press". This deliberately being broadcast daily by the networks with full knowledge that a half truth is more deceitful than a whole lie.

I am aware that your efforts and mine toward changing the left-wing, liberal trend in this system (whatever their motive) is comparable to dipping the ocean dry with a two quart bucket. You have my complete support.

Your editorial was refreshing, please continue.

Yours truly,

RAYMOND HAYES.

DALEVILLE, ALA.

Letter to the Editor:

Your editorial in *The Enterprise* needs to be read by everyone but I suspect that few will read it all—and carefully. I do agree with you, and further, I suggest that there is only one answer that will counteract the gross injustice of biased reporting.

There is no way to stop me and you, the reader and listener, from searching out several sources of information. Choose these from the full range of opinion from the ultra-liberal to the ultra-conservative. I read columnists and editorials daily from 3 to 5 newspapers, 2 weekly news magazines and several monthly publications. The T.V. screen is the least influence and least reliable for me of any—because I know most of the T.V. Newsmen's slanted opinions before they start to give it. I rely on the sum total of what I read, then form a solid, factual background for my analysis. Any American voter must dig everywhere he can to get the big picture—so that he or she will be well informed on the major issues—as well as the local school board and the local Town Council!

Let's put wings to our prayers for peace by supporting President Nixon (and Sec. of State, Kissinger) the rest of his term of office, tackle domestic problems—and see if we can do something constructive instead of destructive.

Sincerely,

CLYDE W. JONES.

P.S. I forgot to mention that the School, Church, and Public Libraries all get some of my reading time and we need to instill the inquiring mind—the desire for knowledge in our students and/or our children so that they too will be well informed. I am a life member of P.T.A., Member of the Clay-hatchee Council, Tennis instructor, Shop Steward IAM Local 2003 and have a family of 7 children and 8 grandchildren.

DALEVILLE, ALA.

Letter to the Editor:

Thank you for your fine editorial "In Defense of Nixon," October 31, 1973, in *The Enterprise*. I believe that there are a lot of people who voted for President Nixon who believe in him, but who have not come forward and voiced their beliefs. One of our freedoms in the United States is "Innocent until proven guilty." How ironic, the newscasters of television have helped, with their biased reporting, to slant people's views of the President. These newscasters, in fact, have judged and accused him. They have the powerful people of the United States "running scared."

I don't feel the people have suffered great humiliation as members of Congress, fellow Republicans calling for impeachment, are telling them. President Nixon has done an outstanding job in office, standing up under tremendous strain and extreme pressure. Have his accusers, particularly those who voted for him, thought how they would stand up to such ridicule, under extreme, adverse pressure if known friends suddenly turned against them?

A woman I talked to at the library tonight said, "Yes, I voted for Nixon. But he's gone too far. He knew those tapes were missing three months ago. He's been lying!" After

talking further with her, she said, "Yes, I voted for him, but it was because I didn't want McGovern as President." She was never really a believer.

Julie Nixon Eisenhower was interviewed by Barbara Walters on NBC last Friday morning. She said words to this effect: Don't you think that Judge Sirica will get the best qualified people in the United States to go over the tapes to see if they have been tampered with and as to the missing tapes, don't you think that the Presidential log will be checked as to telephone calls, times, visitors, etc. Experts will be called in.

Believers of freedom, truth, and what's right in our United States know that freedom will prevail and truth will prevail. Should President Nixon be guilty, he will be proven so.

Do people sincerely feel that President Nixon has really hurt the United States since he has been in office? He stopped the Vietnam War; he brought back our prisoners of war; we're on speaking terms with Red China and, although that might not sound so good to some people, it could prevent or deter a possible war; and as President Nixon mentioned on TV last week, because he knows Russia's Brezhnev as well as he does and Brezhnev knows him equally well, possible confrontation between our two nations was averted over the Mid-East crisis. Nonbelievers should think many times before joining the cries for impeachment.

If people believe that President Nixon is innocent of any wrong-doing, they should write to him and write to their newspapers, and tell them so. They should give President Nixon their support. Let him know that the silent majority is no longer silent! Although it's late, it may not be too late! Give him more courage!

Thank you again, Terry, and if you don't mind, I plan to send your editorial, in fact the whole newspaper, to President Nixon along with a copy of my letter to you.

Sincerely,

ANNE GATLIN.

A DISPLAY OF CAPITAL ELITISM

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, there is a significant difference between what most Americans are thinking and what some of those who describe them say they are thinking. Often, attitudes which are frequently reported are simply those attitudes which a small number of people have decided are "acceptable."

Such individuals have appointed themselves to be spokesmen for the rest of us. How wrong they can be was shown in the results of the 1972 election. The majority of self-appointed interpreters of public opinion supported the candidacy of Senator GEORGE MCGOVERN. The people, of course, did something far different.

A recent example of such a self-appointed reporter of the attitudes of the American people was the performance of Washington hostess Barbara Howar on the Johnny Carson television show.

At that time, reports Chicago Tribune columnist Bob Wiedrich, a man well known for his fairness and objectivity, Mrs. Howar presumed to become a

spokeswoman for all 200 million Americans, telling them exactly what they were feeling and thinking about the President of the United States with the authority of someone who had a firm grip on the pulse of the Nation.

Mr. Wiedrich concluded that:

In her pseudo-sophisticated circles, it is highly doubtful that Barbara hears what the working stiffs of Washington are saying or what the better than 50 per cent black population of that town think about Nixon. Or, for that matter what people think in Chicago . . . Yet, Barbara presumes to speak for us all. And Carson furnishes her the forum. Sometimes, we think, President Nixon does have a point.

I wish to share with my colleagues the column by Bob Wiedrich, "Another Display of Capital Elitism," as it appeared in the Chicago Tribune of November 14, 1973, and insert it into the RECORD at this time:

ANOTHER DISPLAY OF CAPITAL ELITISM
(By Bob Wiedrich)

There is a strange, sometimes incurable malaise that often infects folks who move to Washington.

It is called Potomac Fever and tends to restrict the victim's vision to that relatively small plot of real estate from whence are conducted the nation's affairs.

In several cases, sufferers have been known to freak out, completely losing their sense of proportion. They come to believe that the District of Columbia is, in fact, the whole of the United States and that that vast hinterland somewhere way out there is populated by faceless no-accounts to whom the inhabitants of their tiny enclave owe no allegiance.

In many ways, it is the ultimate in snobbery. Yet, it is a quite provincial view. According to diagnosticians, the disease is difficult to avoid. There is no immunization except common sense.

Once contracted, it quickly attacks any perspective of what goes on elsewhere in the land. For the germ that causes Potomac Fever breeds rapidly in close proximity to the base of national power, especially when permitted to rub shoulders daily with the great decision makers of our time.

The other night, approximately 500,000 American TV viewers received a clinical demonstration of the ravages of Potomac Fever on a 38-year-old blonde who has not only rubbed shoulders with the mighty, but publicly admits having shared a U.S. senator's sack during an idyllic Jamaican interlude in her youth.

Since you can't get much closer to the seat of power than that, those watching the Johnny Carson Tonight Show undoubtedly were willing to accept former Washington hostess Barbara Howar's credentials as a self-appointed spokeswoman for the Capital jet set.

But bouncy Barbara went a giant step farther than that. She presumed to become a spokeswoman for all 200 million Americans, telling them exactly what they were feeling and thinking about the President of the United States with the authority of someone who had a firm grip on the pulse of the nation.

For some 10 minutes, this neatly coiffed member of the Washington Over-the-Hill gang assailed Richard M. Nixon as tho he was some common criminal already indicted and convicted of high crimes of treason. With no restraints on her venom, she repeatedly demanded his impeachment or resignation.

That was what the American people wanted, she suggested, continually relying on unnamed "people" in Washington as her authority.

"There's a feeling in Washington . . ." Or

"People in Washington feel . . ." Or "People in Washington are saying . . ." Or variations of that same labored anonymous litany.

To Mrs. Howar, it was obvious there was no place else in the United States but Washington. Surely, the nation would founder without the thought processes of the Washington cocktail set to guide it. No one else was capable of reaching an independent judgment. Only Washington could furnish a reasoned, dispassionate decision on the successes or failures of Richard M. Nixon. And that judgment, of course, had already been made.

However, had any of the estimated 500,000 people who watch the Tonight Show examined Mrs. Howar's credentials more closely they might have realized they were being victimized by a pint-sized put-on.

In the first place, this blond babe is trying to peddle her published memoirs as a one-time society hostess and senatorial helpmate. Secondly, her fading reputation as a swinging jet-setter is badly in need of refurbishing after earlier successes during the John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson regimes.

Barbara doesn't get to scoot about town with Pat Nixon and Julie Eisenhower as she did with Lady Bird and Lucy Bird and Lynda Bird.

And further, the Georgetown society crowd with which she hangs around are the same professional Nixon haters who still can't forgive the President for accomplishing things Jack Kennedy couldn't do. They are virtually a government in exile and hardly speak for Washington, much less the rest of the land.

In her pseudo-sophisticated circles, it is highly doubtful Barbara hears what the working stiffs of Washington are saying or what the better than 50 per cent black population of that town think about Nixon. Or, for that matter, what people think in Chicago. For when she ventures into the hinterland, she does out her interviews at the Ambassador East Hotel, hardly a spa of the common man.

Yet, Barbara presumes to speak for us all. And Carson furnishes her the forum. Sometimes, we think, President Nixon does have a point.

WHY THE PRESIDENT SHOULD RESIGN

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, last Tuesday, I introduced House Resolution 684 calling upon President Nixon to resign. At the time of the introduction of this resolution, and subsequently before this body I have explained my reasons for calling for this drastic act. I can put these reasons no more forcefully or eloquently than to quote Bayard Rustin, the great leader and philosopher in the movement for human rights:

The President no longer has the ability to govern effectively, nor the moral legitimacy to guide the course of the nation.

Mr. Rustin's column in the New York Voice of November 9, 1973, sets forth in measured, reasoned terms the reasons why the President must resign to restore credibility to his high office. I place Mr. Rustin's column in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

NIXON SHOULD RESIGN

The most distressing thing about the governmental crisis which has engulfed America is that the President does not seem to recog-

nize that a crisis in fact exists. Instead of facing the issues involved, he obscures them, projecting himself as the victim of a malicious press and questioning the motives of Special Prosecutor Cox. He persists in the policy of concealment and subterfuge that has marked the Administration's response ever since the time, many months ago, when Nixon supporters dismissed the Watergate break-in as a "caper." Neither the President's actions nor his words suggest an awareness that withholding potential evidence from a criminal prosecution represents a blatant disregard of basic democratic and constitutional principles.

The Constitution demands that the President "take care that the laws be faithfully executed." This is an absolute responsibility, but subject to individual whim. And yet the President has chosen to ignore this responsibility, submitting neither to its spirit or letter until forced to bend by the bipartisan outrage of the nation.

RULE OF LAW

This is particularly unsettling for blacks, since our civil liberties depend above all else on the President's determination to enforce the law, regardless of his political philosophy. Although opposed to the 1954 Brown decision, President Eisenhower ordered federal troops into Little Rock when Governor Faubus defied court desegregation directives. Had he placed his natural impulse above the obligation to ensure that the law is carried out, Eisenhower would have set back the civil rights movement for years to come, while destroying the federal system of government.

By surrendering the tapes to Judge Sirica, the President has done little to allay the worst fears of Americans. There are still unanswered questions, and the President has made it abundantly clear that, short of another judicial confrontation, he will not provide the answers. These questions suggest broad implications about the functioning of democracy. The ITT case, for example, calls to question whether national policy was being formulated on the basis of law, or was determined by the promises of campaign contributions. Then there are the questions about the President's land transactions and other personal financial dealings; whether the President was taking advantage of high office for personal enrichment.

To prejudice these cases before the proper officials have examined all the facts would do an unconscionable injustice to the President and to our system of law. The dilemma facing Americans is that the President will not cooperate with a full and impartial investigation, thus thwarting the only means of removing the cloud of suspicion which hovers over his office. As the AFL-CIO, said, in calling for the President's resignation: "When the President appears fearful of facing a Supreme Court composed in large measure of his own appointees, the public can scarcely resist the darkest speculations."

The crisis which the President has brought upon himself and the nation has multiplied and deepened our problems. Our domestic policy can be summed up in one word: "veto." Our foreign policy is suffering at a time it can least afford to suffer.

I do not contemplate the possibility of the President's resigning or his impeachment with any feeling of elation. Nor do I call for his removal from office because of political differences, profound as they may be.

CANNOT GOVERN EFFECTIVELY

The fact is, however, that the President no longer has the ability to govern effectively, nor the moral legitimacy to guide the course of the nation.

The only principled alternative left is for him to resign, and spare the country a protracted, agonizing period when we would be, I fear, without a leader. And if Nixon fails to resign, I feel it is incumbent on the Congress to initiate impeachment proceedings. Should the President ultimately leave office,

Congress would be then well advised to consider the appointment of a bipartisan government, with the two major parties sharing the presidency and vice presidency, as has been proposed by Sen. Inouye of Hawaii.

I believe that the resignation of Richard Nixon would serve the genuine interest of the United States, for this country cannot absorb the almost daily crises which the President seems incapable of averting. As I write this, the White House has announced that the two most important tapes never existed; already there is speculation over whether this part of the President's efforts to cover-up wrong-doing. Because of the pattern he has established, every move the President makes evokes suspicion and cynicism. We cannot endure this for three more years.

Lyndon Johnson was elected President in 1964 with a mandate in all respects as decisive as that Nixon received in last year's election. Four years later, having compiled a record of unprecedented domestic accomplishment, Johnson declined to seek reelection, not because of any impropriety on his part, but because he was convinced that to do so was in the best interests of national unity and world peace. If Lyndon Johnson, under the attack of a small tough high vocal minority, was capable of an act of high statesmanship, it is not presumptuous to expect Richard Nixon, having lost the confidence of the overwhelming majority of Americans, to take the same difficult step.

HON. GERALD R. FORD ADDRESSES
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, November 13, 1973, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, minority leader of the House and Vice-President-Designate, spoke at the opening session of the National Association of Realtors 66th annual convention at the Sheraton Park Hotel in Washington, D.C.

Because I sincerely believe the Vice-President-designate's address will be of interest to all my colleagues, I am inserting his remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In these days of charges and accusations, of innuendos and hearsay, I fully agree with Representative Ford that it is time we look at the record. I think it is time the American people gave a little thought to the competency and leadership of the man who brought the Vietnam war to an honorable conclusion, who thawed and opened the diplomatic doors of peace to China and Russia, who brilliantly avoided a confrontation with Russia in the current Mideast crisis. It is time they began to judge the President objectively and honestly on the basis of his stewardship as Chief Executive of the United States.

In my opinion, Vice-President-Designate Ford has properly and articulately illustrated what a strong, able and courageous leader we have in President Nixon. Representative Ford has urged the National Association of Realtors to join with him in affirming their confidence and support for the President of

the United States for the sake of a stronger and more unified Nation.

Vice-President-Designate FORD's remarks are as follows:

REMARKS BY VICE-PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE GERALD R. FORD BEFORE THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF REALTORS CONVENTION, SHERATON PARK HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D.C., TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1973

It is a pleasure for me to be here this morning taking part in the opening session of the NAR's 66th annual convention. I am not just here for myself, however. President Nixon has asked me to extend his greetings and best wishes to those of you who are here for this event today, and to all the 500,000 men and women who have made the NAR the largest American trade association representing a single industry.

As realtors you represent a vital part of our national economy, and I am proud to say that although it still has its share of problems, the American economy is in great shape today and growing stronger every minute.

So much has been happening lately—both good and bad—that some vital national statistics have been lost in the shuffle. During the month of October, while most eyes were understandably turned toward Watergate, the Middle East or the energy crisis, the American economy quietly achieved President Nixon's target figure for reduced unemployment. That overall figure is now down to 4.5 per cent and the unemployment rate for adult males is the lowest it has even been in America during peacetime. At the same time, last month we had the second consecutive monthly drop in wholesale prices.

This is not spectacular news because it isn't shocking or depressing. It is just plain good news. And it is persuasive evidence that, despite some very serious obstacles, the Nixon Administration is making solid progress in delivering what it promised the American people last November—an era of genuine prosperity—prosperity in peacetime.

Hard as it may be for us to realize it now, this may be the big story of the past few months when historians look back on them in the years to come—the story of how a beleaguered Administration, with the support of the people and the backing of responsible Democrats and Republicans in the Congress, succeeded in bringing new prosperity to America and new hope for peace in the world in spite of political turmoil at home.

Even without Watergate, that success story would be dramatic. With Watergate, it is little short of miraculous. But it has been achieved.

In spite of Watergate, the President's diplomatic initiatives have succeeded in making a fresh beginning for peace in the Middle East. For the first time in a generation, Arabs and Israelis have both expressed a willingness to sit down and discuss their differences. For the first time since the birth of the state of Israel, there is hope that the legacy of hatred and violence can be set aside—that reasonable negotiation can replace bloody confrontation in this troubled part of the world.

No other American President—no other world leader, for that matter—was ever able to achieve this. Richard Nixon, the man that some people have referred to as a crippled President, has achieved it.

That's quite a track record for a cripple. It reminds me of a speech that was made in the Canadian Senate and House of Commons in 1941 by a very distinguished visitor—a man named Winston Churchill. In his speech, Churchill described the situation in Europe after the fall of France, when England stood alone against the combined forces of the Axis powers.

When Churchill had warned the French that Britain would fight on alone whatever

they did, the French generals had advised their government that, "In three weeks England will have her neck wrung like a chicken."

"Some chicken," Churchill reflected, "some neck."

Today we hear a lot of voices that sound very much like those defeated and defeatist French generals and politicians. We are told that President Nixon is a paralyzed prisoner, incapable of acting. Some suggest that he should resign or be impeached.

I see it a different way. I look at Richard Nixon's record on building a healthy peacetime economy; on working to achieve peace in Southeast Asia and the Middle East; on giving this Nation a comprehensive program for meeting the energy challenge—I look at all this and my answer to the critics is simple. Some prisoner; some paralysis.

If Richard Nixon can achieve all that he has for this country in the last few weeks as a "cripple" then he is the best argument this Nation ever had for hiring the handicapped.

That doesn't mean that we don't have a real problem of public confidence on our hands.

It is real, it is big and it isn't going to go away overnight if we simply ignore it.

But it is not invincible. There is no credibility problem in the world too big for the truth to overcome. And with the release to the court of the tapes, and with the testimony that will be heard in the days ahead, that is what we are going to get—the truth. I am convinced that once the full truth is known, President Nixon will be exonerated.

Unfortunately, there always some people so eager to reach a verdict that they don't bother to wait for evidence.

For some of them, nothing—not even the truth—will make any difference. They have made up their minds, and even the facts will not change them. But such people are only a small minority.

I believe that a majority of Americans, and a majority of the men and women on both sides of the aisle in the Congress, are going to come out of this Watergate ordeal with their confidence raised and their trust restored—not only in the President, but in the American political system as well.

As realtors, you have seen the same process take place in another sphere. You know how emotional speculation can drive the price of land or buildings up and down over the short term. But you also know that, in the long run, the real market value—the honest worth of the property—will make itself felt once the hysteria has ceased and people have the full facts at their disposal.

The same thing is true of government. There are and always will be periods of crisis when emotion, even hysteria, get the upper hand. But, in a free, informed society, good sense wins out in the end—good sense and fair play.

The difference between a politician and a statesman, according to an old saying, is that the politician thinks about the next election but the statesman thinks about the next generation.

Those who are looking to the next generation, and who have a sense of history, know that, given the facts and due deliberation, cooler, fairer heads will prevail. They know that what might seem like an easy shortcut today—a quick escape from temporary annoyances—could actually inflict deep, permanent scars on the American political system. And let us never forget that those scars would be borne by the next generation of Americans.

I have faith that the courts will get to the bottom of this case. I have faith that the President will act with honor and integrity in the performance of his duty, and above all, as one who has spent a quarter of a century as a Member of the United States Con-

gress, I have faith in the Congress—faith that it, too, will not be panicked into unwise action or dominated by a few shrill, extreme voices.

But the biggest single factor in all of this is not any one of the three branches of government I have just mentioned. It is you, the people of this great country of ours.

Through the entire Watergate ordeal, most of the people have reacted with quiet patience, waiting for the full story to unfold. Their aim has been to judge fairly from the facts.

Most, but not all. There are a number of pressure groups that have always been opposed to the Nixon Administration and to the programs that it has pursued, despite the fact that those programs were overwhelmingly endorsed by the American people last November.

These opponents have been very busy in the last few weeks. Newspaper ads calling for impeachment or resignation and urging letter-writing campaigns to the Congress have abounded and Congressional offices have been bombarded with letters and telegrams. One member of the Senate, Bill Scott of Virginia, recently ran a spot check of the mountain of mail he had received calling for the ouster of the President and he found that most of the people who were so loudly making this demand today had voted against Richard Nixon last November. They were trying to use Watergate as a weapon to reverse an election they didn't agree with and didn't win.

Meanwhile, the famous "silent majority" has been living up to its name.

I hope that each of you, when you return home from this great gathering, will take the time to express your personal view to your Senators and Congressmen. If you really believe that impeachment or resignation is the only answer, by all means say so. But if you are part of that much larger group that believes in fair play and in the important things that Richard Nixon has done and can do for America, don't wait for someone else to do it for you. Speak up and speak now. You deserve to be heard.

Not only that, but your representatives deserve to hear from you. They must hear from both sides on this vital national question.

While you are doing that, I promise you that I will be doing everything I can at my end to see that a spirit of candor, fair play and conciliation prevails between the Capitol, the courts and the White House.

Together, I am convinced that we can emerge from this painful experience as a strong, united people, with a renewed faith in our President and our political system.

OUR NATION SALUTES THE CITY OF PASSAIC, STATE OF NEW JERSEY, ON ITS CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

HON. ROBERT A. ROE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. ROE. Mr. Speaker, during 1973 the city of Passaic of my Eighth Congressional District, State of New Jersey is observing the 100th centennial anniversary of its birth as a city incorporated under the laws of the New Jersey State legislature. It is indeed an historic event in our State and Nation's history and I ask you and my colleagues here in the Congress to join with me in observance of this centennial with a special salute

to the Honorable Gerald Goldman, the distinguished mayor of Passaic, and to the honorable Emil Olszowy, an esteemed member of the governing body and the general chairman of the Passaic Centennial Committee, extending our best wishes to the citizens and governing officials of one of the most industrialized urban communities in America, which is my singular great honor to represent here in the Congress.

The city of Passaic is steeped in the history of the early settlers of our country and as we celebrate this 100-year milestone of its existence as a city incorporated under the laws of New Jersey, we can look back with awe and respect for the spirit and achievements of its people in meeting the great challenges of the 19th and 20th centuries in urban America. Comprised of 3.26 square miles, located 12 miles west of New York City along the Passaic River, in the heart of the northeastern metropolitan region of our country, it has experienced the enormous growing pains of the occupation of people and the massive development that has occurred since man first started harnessing its technology and scientific knowhow in industry for the production of goods and the building of America's leadership position and preeminence in international marketplaces throughout the world. Many historians relate the story of Passaic as the birthplace of television with its principal industries, in addition to television, enumerated as rubber materials, cables, plastics, clothing, food, aircraft components, machinery, and research.

The city of Passaic has indeed flourished under the government of its people to achieve distinction in the laboratory of America's beginnings as a most attractive and good place to live. In 1873, Dr. Benjamin B. Ayerig was appointed the first mayor of the city succeeding the former executive officer of the people of this area, the Honorable Richard A. Terhune, who was president of Passaic when it was organized as a village in our governmental structure. The governing officials of the first and succeeding administrations of the city of Passaic have unstintingly and assiduously served our people in promoting and providing essential public services in pursuit of the health, happiness, safety, and well-being of all of its citizens, and I know you will want to join with me in a hearty tribute to all of their good works as well as our most sincere commendation and best wishes to the present public officials who administer the affairs of Passaic. The current roster of Passaic's eminent administrators is as follows:

The Honorable—
Gerald Goldman, Mayor; Peter Bruce, Council President; Dr. Estelle F. Greenberg, Councilwoman; Robert Hare, Councilman; Fred J. Kuren, Councilman; Emil Olszowy, Councilman; Marge Semler, Councilwoman; and Herbert M. Sorkin, Councilman.

Edward Ancuacs, Tax Collector; Nat Baron, Department of Recreation; George Carter, Purchasing Agent; Elias Drazin, Department of Inspections; Peter Frungello, Director of Welfare; Judge Dominick Giordano, Municipal Judge; Charles Gregory, Acting Tax Assessor; Ken Hill, Chief of Police; Senator Joseph Hirkala, Deputy Clerk; Lewis Jaffe,

Fire Chief; Joseph Kane, Health Department; Anthony Martini, Clerk; Anthony Porretta, Department of Public Works; Ralph Sandor, Engineer; and Albin T. Wolak, Treasurer.

Mr. Speaker, to understand the present, we must understand the past and in order to acquaint you with the historic beginnings of the city of Passaic, I respectfully request your permission to enter at this point in the RECORD some excerpts from a booklet entitled "Passaic, New Jersey" prepared in June 1966 by the Jerseymen of Passaic High School which will provide you with an insight of the way of life in the early days and comprehensive background information on the people who contributed to the building of the city of Passaic and the history of America. Excerpts from this booklet on Passaic's history are as follows:

The land which Passaic occupies was originally a camping ground for the Lenni-Lenape Indians. New Jersey was claimed by the English as part of Virginia, but the Passaic area was settled by the Dutch.

On April 4, 1678, Hartman Michaelse (or Vreeland) bought Dundee Island from the Indians for a bottle of rum, thereby becoming the first settler in the area. Michaelse started a fur trading post, and perfected his title to the land by receiving patents from the Dutch Lords Proprietors for "one fat hen" as quitrent. The area was named Acquackanonk Landing until 1854, when the name Passaic (meaning peaceful) was adopted.

The early settlers divided Acquackanonk into 28 farms, leaving 13 acres for a church. Religious services were begun in 1682, but no church building was constructed until 1693, when the Dutch Low Reformed Church was built. The church property was leased for the purpose of raising money to pay the minister's salary.

Robert Drummond was the first merchant in Passaic, owning a general store. "Big business" came to Passaic in the form of Abraham "Brom" Ackerman, who believed that there is good money in real estate. Ackerman built an extensive line of docks on the Passaic River which he ultimately sold to John Ryerson and Aaron Van Houten.

Many men whose names are familiar in Passaic were merchants—John Nutley, William Spear, Adolph Van Winkle, John Post, Cornelius Vreeland, Adrian Van Houten, and Samuel Van Saun.

Acquackanonk existed for fifty years without a physician; the first one was Jacob Arents, who came from Germany in 1707. John DeVausne was the first resident doctor. Prices were low, a doctor's visit cost, at most, fifty cents.

A free dispensary was begun in Passaic in 1891. Through the gifts of Miss Susan Palmer and Mrs. Joseph Hegeman in 1892, land comprising 70 city lots was secured for the purpose of building a hospital between Boulevard and Lafayette Avenue. The hospital, with endowments of \$300,000, was built with a capacity of 47 patients.

In August, 1895, St. Mary's Hospital was chartered. Reverend J. A. Sheppard purchased the building on Pennington Avenue, arousing the ire of the neighbors, who objected to a hospital in their vicinity. Nevertheless, the hospital opened on November 8, 1898. Beth Israel Hospital was opened on Madison Street in March, 1927. The hospital is now located on Parker Avenue in an up-to-date building.

The first official road in Passaic was the Paterson and Hamburg Turnpike Road which led from Acquackanonk Landing to Deckertown. Constructed in 1809, the road had toll houses, and it was used by several stage coach lines. The Erie Railroad put the

highway out of business, and it became Main Avenue. Before the construction of the log-base Paterson and New York Plank Road in 1880, the only way to New York City was by boat via Newark. . .

In the middle of the nineteenth century, Passaic was a small town, filled with pre-Revolutionary War buildings. Streets, also, were different. Loveland (Passaic Street!) had only three buildings. Washington Place was a daisy field; East Main Avenue was called Cow Path; and Main Avenue was a muddy lane. There was only one public school, and no banks or sidewalks. . .

No history of the city would be complete without some mention of Passaic industries. In 1735, Stephen Basset established a tannery here, the first manufacturing industry in the state. Aside from a few mills, this tannery was the only Passaic industry until it ceased production in 1845. James Shepard opened a bleachery in 1813; it was located on the Weasel Brook, Acquackanonk, just outside the city limits.

Passaic became an industrial center for the following reasons; it had an ideal location, the railroads facilitated transportation, and the canal and river supplied water and aided navigation.

The largest industry was the textile industry. The early magnates of that industry were Peter Reid and Henry A. Barry. The Botany Worsted Mills began production in 1889. During the First World War, the Botany Company employed 6,850 people. In 1904, Julius Forstmann opened the Forstmann and Huffmann Company. The earliest textile mill in Passaic was the Passaic Print Works, founded by W. S. Locke in 1873. Unfortunately, all the Passaic textile industries have now left the city and population has decreased. . .

Outstanding companies were Okonite Mills established in 1888, (insulated wires), Pantasote Leather Company (artificial leather—"more beautiful and lasting than natural leather"), Paterson Parchment Paper Company, and Manhattan Rubber Manufacturing Company. . .

The growth of industry in Passaic called for banking institutions; and from 1869 to 1886 unsuccessful attempts were made to establish a bank. Passaic residents had to do their banking in New York or in Paterson. The Panic of 1873 helped check the movement for banking in town.

In 1886, Robert D. Kent organized the Passaic National Bank. The city's second bank, the State Trust and Safe Deposit Company opened in 1890. It later became the People's Bank and Trust Company. . .

Mr. Speaker, the city of Passaic, as is typical of many of our highly industrialized communities born in America's cradle of industry, is presently being whiplashed by the wake of the catapult of development that accompanies the expansion and relocation of industry out of the city to seek larger quarters elsewhere. The people of Passaic are presently recuperating from the loss of two substantial national manufacturing companies who closed their doors and created a serious unemployment situation.

In reviewing Passaic's 100 years of urban experience, and contemplating the future of Passaic, the highly prestigious newspaper of Passaic-Clifton, the Herald News, provided capsule reports and statements of many leading citizens of Passaic in their Passaic centennial edition of July 30, 1973. The overwhelming enthusiasm and energetic efforts of all of the people of Passaic who have contributed and continue to contribute their lifetime endeavors towards the preserva-

tion and enhancement of their rich heritage are eloquently depicted in these statements. The following excerpt from the Herald News "Passaic Centennial Edition" of the statement made by the Passaic Centennial Committee is submitted herewith to be forever lastingly etched in our historic journal of Congress, as follows:

A CITY WITH A PROUD PAST—AND A MORE PROMISING FUTURE

One good century deserves another! On this occasion of the 100th Birthday celebration, Passaic looks forward to its Downtown Renewal Project.

With improved new public facilities, new housing, renewal of commercial and industrial areas, the future is indeed promising. Focusing on better community understanding, progressive educational techniques, we eagerly look ahead to a better tomorrow for the entire community.

The Passaic Centennial Committee is comprised of many highly reputable and leading citizens of our community who have been proudly and busily working with residents of the community in formulating patriotic, religious, and civic programs throughout the city in celebration of this historical event. The members of the committee are as follows:

PASSAIC CENTENNIAL

CHAIRMEN

Emil Olszowy, General Chairman.
Martin Fried, Arts and Sciences.
William Field, Contest.
Dr. Estelle Greenberg, History.
Dante Mecca, Carnival.
Joseph Bloomfield, Speakers Bureau.
Fr. Dan Noonan, Religious Affairs.
John Wojtowicz, Jr., Coordinator.
Carmen Russo, Antique Car Show.
William Coffey and George Coronato, Parade.

Edward M. Kudla, Special Events.
Dan Ryan, Junior Olympics.
Joan Scancarella, Publicity.
Richard O'Brien, Finance.
Joseph Giordano, Picnic.

COMMITTEE

Charles Andieszky, Angel Aponte, Jack Baker, Mrs. Albert Barowitz, Helen Billack, Mary Billack, Joseph Braunstein, Julius Bressolur, Peter Bruce, Frank Cannata, Mary Catena, Andrew Celmar, Alice Cerasia, Francis Cinnamon, Bertha Clark, Ralph A. Cone, Lorenzo Copeles, Comm. Wm. B. Cruise, James DeBlase, Walter Demarest, Pedro Diaz, Leon Ehrlich, Donald Farinella, Andrew Farniga, Rene Feliciano, Tom Gamble, Peter Garbera, Georgia Gardner, Frank Giacommaro, Antoinette Giaconia, Rosemarie Giordano, Robert Goldberg, and Stanley Gradzki.

Harry Greenwald, Adrey Havriliak, Merlene Hayden, Ann Holster, Bob Holster, David Hotzman, Edward Jackson, Vinnie Jasper, Alan Juszcyk, Marie Knapp, Gregory Komeshek, Harold Kramer, Elizabeth Kuhlwillm, Phyllis Kuren, Jean Lazar, Arthur R. Lepow, Charles Locker, Gene LoPresti, Ken Lutzker, Jane Mandelbaum, Skippy Manney, Adeline Miller, Doris Miller, David Minsky, Mrs. Martin T. Moran, Samuel Nadel, Ivan Nelson, Charles Page, Mattie Mizenko, Ronald Olszowy, Katherine Peck, Bart Plescia, and M/M J. Pojanowski, Jr.

Marian Race, Luis Ramos, Jack Reynolds, Joanna Reynolds, Rolin Rodriguez, Col. John Roosma, Mrs. A. D. Rosenberg, Dr. M. H. Saffron, Thomas Scheer, Mrs. A. E. Scheffrin, Samuel Schultz, Mrs. John Sciranka, William Struggs, Joseph Sefchik, Vincent Seminara, Dr. A. F. Senaldi, Dr. James Shenton, Marilyn Sniatkowski, Arthur Sparaga, Rev. Donald Steine, Albin J. Stolarik, David Streit, Marjorie Swartz, Dary Tencza, Joyce Tencza, Walter Tencza, Mrs. Pat Trawinski, Rose-

marie Trentacoste, Frances Vill'Neuve, Lee Wagner, Jerry Wallace, Arthur Walls, and Joseph Weiss.

Mr. Speaker, with the greatest admiration and respect I am pleased to commend to you and our colleagues these highly respected community leaders. A massive reconstruction and revitalization program is being fostered by the governing officials and citizens of Passaic with the undaunted spirit and determination indigenous to the people of America. I know you will want to join with me in extending the heartiest congratulations of the Congress and best wishes to the good people of the city of Passaic during the 1973 celebration of their 100th anniversary. We do indeed salute the city of Passaic and all of its citizens as we observe and commemorate this first century of progress and look ahead with them to the second century of opportunity which is indeed a great challenge not only for the people of Passaic, but all of urban America.

COX FIRING HELD ILLEGAL

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, Senator Moss, Representative Abzug, and myself joined as plaintiffs in a suit asking that the dismissal of Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox be declared illegal. It was our contention that President Nixon's directive to Acting Attorney General Bork to fire Mr. Cox, and then Mr. Bork's carrying out of that directive, were actions contrary to Justice Department regulations that stated quite clearly that the special prosecutor could only be removed for "extraordinary improprieties."

No such contention of impropriety was ever made by the President or Mr. Bork and, therefore, we believed that the firing was illegal.

Our view was confirmed earlier today when U.S. District Judge Gerhard A. Gesell declared the Cox firing to be illegal.

It is my belief, Mr. Speaker, that this decision has quite important ramifications for the Congress as it debates the issue of impeachment. I have charged the President with obstruction of justice in the impeachment resolution which I introduced in the House of Representatives on October 23 for myself and 30 cosponsors. We now have a court decision holding that the dismissal of Mr. Cox was illegal—and, therefore, it is clear that my charges of obstruction of justice have been given added credence.

Mr. Speaker, because of the overriding importance of this court decision, I now insert its full text into the RECORD:

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

MEMORANDUM

Ralph Nader, Senator Frank E. Moss, Representative Bella S. Abzug, and Representative Jerome R. Waldie, Plaintiffs, v. Robert H. Bork, Acting Attorney General of the United States, Defendant. Civil Action No. 1954-73. This is a declaratory judgment and in-

junction action arising out of the discharge of Archibald Cox from the office of Watergate Special Prosecutor. Defendant Robert H. Bork was the Acting Attorney General who discharged Mr. Cox. Plaintiffs named in the Amended Complaint are as listed above.

Some issues have already been decided. The matter first came before the Court on plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction and a request that the trial of the action on the merits be consolidated with the preliminary injunction pursuant to Rule 5(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Defendant filed opposition papers, and a hearing was held on the detailed affidavits and briefs filed by the parties. The Court determined that the case was in proper posture for a determination on the merits at that time.

All injunctive relief requested in the proposed preliminary injunction tendered at the hearing and in the Amended Complaint was denied from the bench. The effect of the injunctions sought would have been to reinstate Mr. Cox as Watergate Special Prosecutor and to halt the Watergate investigation until he had reassumed control. It appeared to the Court that Mr. Cox's participation in this case was required before such relief could be granted. See Rule 19(a) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. Yet Mr. Cox has not entered into this litigation, nor has he otherwise sought to be reinstated as Special Prosecutor. On the contrary, his return to prior duties at Harvard has been publicly announced. Moreover, a new Watergate Special Prosecutor was sworn in on November 5, 1973, and the Court felt that the public interest would not be served by placing any restrictions upon his on-going investigation of Watergate-related matters.

Plaintiffs continue to press for a declaratory judgment on the only remaining issue to be resolved: the legality of the discharge of Mr. Cox and of the temporary abolition of the Office of Watergate Special Prosecutor. To this end, it must initially be determined whether plaintiffs have standing and whether a justiciable controversy still exists.

Defendant Bork contends that the congressional plaintiffs lack standing¹ and that the controversy is moot. This position is without merit. The discharge of Mr. Cox precipitated a widespread concern, if not lack of confidence, in the administration of justice. Numerous bills are pending in the Senate and House of Representatives which attempt to insulate the Watergate inquiries and prosecutions from Executive interference, and impeachment of the President because of his alleged role in the Watergate matter—including the firing of Mr. Cox—is under active consideration.² Given these unusual circumstances, the standing of the three congressional plaintiffs to pursue their effort to obtain a judicial determination as to the legality of the Cox discharge falls squarely within the recent holding of the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit in *Mitchell v. Laird*, No. 71-1510 (D.C. Cir. March 20, 1973). Faced with a challenge by a group of congressmen to the legality of the Indo-China War, the Court recognized standing in the following forceful terms:

"If we, for the moment, assume that defendants' actions in continuing the hostilities in Indo-China were or are beyond the authority conferred upon them by the Constitution, a declaration to that effect would bear upon the duties of plaintiffs to consider whether to impeach defendants, and upon plaintiffs' quite distinct and different duties to make appropriations to support the hostilities, such as raising an army or enacting other civil or criminal legislation. In our view, these considerations are sufficient to give plaintiffs a standing to make their complaint. . . ."

Id. at 4.

Unable to distinguish this holding, defendant Bork suggests that the instant case has been mooted by subsequent events and that the Court as a discretionary matter should refuse to rule on the legality of the Cox discharge. This view of the matter is more academic than realistic, and fails to recognize the insistent demand for some degree of certainty with regard to these distressing events which have engendered considerable public distrust of government. There is a pressing need to declare a rule of law that will give guidance for future conduct with regard to the Watergate inquiry.

While it is perfectly true that the importance of the question presented cannot alone save a case from mootness, *Marchand v. Director, United States Probation Office*, 421 F. 2d 331, 333 (1st Cir. 1970), the congressional plaintiffs before the Court have a substantial and continuing interest in this litigation. It is an undisputed fact that pending legislation may be affected by the outcome of this dispute and that the challenged conduct of the defendant could be repeated with regard to the new Watergate Special Prosecutor if he presses too hard,³ an event which would undoubtedly prompt further congressional action. This situation not only saves the case from mootness, see *United States v. Concentrated Phosphate Export Assoc.*, 393 U.S. 199, 203-04 (1968); *Friend v. United States*, 388 F. 2d 579 (D.C. Cir. 1957), but forces decision. The Court has before it an issue that is far from speculative and a strong showing has been made that judicial determination of that issue is required by the public interest. Under these circumstances, it would be an abuse of discretion not to act.

Turning then to the merits, the facts are not in dispute and must be briefly stated to place the legal discussion in the proper context.

The duties and responsibilities of the Office of Watergate Special Prosecutor were set forth in a formal Department of Justice regulation,⁴ as authorized by statute.⁵ This regulation gave the Watergate Special Prosecutor very broad power to investigate and prosecute offenses arising out of the Watergate break-in, the 1972 Presidential election, and allegations involving the President, members of the White House staff or presidential appointees. Specifically, he was charged with responsibility to conduct court proceedings and to determine whether or not to contest assertions of Executive privilege. He was to remain in office until a date mutually agreed upon between the Attorney General and himself, and it was provided that "The Special Prosecutor will not be removed from his duties except for extraordinary improprieties on his part."

On the same day that this regulation was promulgated, Archibald Cox was designated as Watergate Special Prosecutor.⁶ Less than four months later, Mr. Cox was fired by defendant Bork. It is freely admitted that he was not discharged for an extraordinary impropriety.⁷ Instead, Mr. Cox was discharged on the order of the President because he was insisting upon White House compliance with a Court Order which was no longer subject to further judicial review. After the Attorney General had resigned rather than fire Mr. Cox on this ground and the Deputy Attorney General had been discharged for refusing to do so, defendant Bork formally dismissed Mr. Cox on October 20, 1973, sending the following letter:⁸

"DEAR Mr. Cox: As provided by Title 28, Section 508(b) of the United States Code and Title 28, Section 0.132(a) of the Code of Federal Regulations, I have today assumed the duties of Acting Attorney General.

"In that capacity I am, as instructed by the President, discharging you, effective at

once, from your position as Special Prosecutor, Watergate Special Prosecution Force.

"Very truly yours,

"ROBERT H. BORK,
"Acting Attorney General."

Thereafter, on October 23, Mr. Bork rescinded the underlying Watergate Special Prosecutor regulation, retroactively, effective as of October 21.⁹

The issues presented for declaratory judgment are whether Mr. Cox was lawfully discharged by defendant on October 20, while the regulation was still in existence, and, if not, whether the subsequent cancellation of the regulation lawfully accomplished his discharge. Both suppositions will be considered.

It should first be noted that Mr. Cox was not nominated by the President and did not serve at the President's pleasure. As an appointee of the Attorney General,¹⁰ Mr. Cox served subject to congressional rather than Presidential control. See *Myers v. United States*, 272 U.S. 52 (1926). The Attorney General derived his authority to hire Mr. Cox and to fix his term of service from various Acts of Congress.¹¹ Congress therefore had the power directly to limit the circumstances under which Mr. Cox could be discharged, see *United States v. Perkins*, 116 U.S. 483 (1886), and to delegate that power to the Attorney General, see *Service v. Dulles*, 354 U.S. 363 (1957). Had no such limitations been issued, the Attorney General would have had the authority to fire Mr. Cox at any time and for any reason. However, he chose to limit his own authority in this regard by promulgating the Watergate Special Prosecutor regulation previously described. It is settled beyond dispute that under such circumstances an agency regulation has the force and effect of law, and is binding upon the body that issues it. *Accardi v. Shaughnessy*, 347 U.S. 260 (1954) ("Accardi I"); *Bonita v. Wirtz*, 369 F.2d 208 (D.C. Cir. 1966); *American Broadcasting Co. v. F.T.C.*, 179 F.2d 437 (D.C. Cir. 1949); *United States v. Chapman*, 179 F. Supp. 447 (E.D. N.Y. 1959). As the Ninth Circuit observed in *United States v. Short*, 240 F.2d 292, 298 (9th Cir. 1956):

"An administrative regulation promulgated within the authority granted by statute has the force of law and will be given full effect by the courts."

Even more directly on point, the Supreme Court has twice held that an Executive department may not discharge one of its officers in a manner inconsistent with its own regulations concerning such discharge. See *Vitarelli v. Seaton*, 359 U.S. 535 (1959); *Service v. Dulles*, *supra*. The firing of Archibald Cox in the absence of a finding of extraordinary impropriety was in clear violation of an existing Justice Department regulation having the force of law and was therefore illegal.

Defendant suggests that, even if Mr. Cox's discharge had been unlawful on October 20, the subsequent abolition of the Office of Watergate Special Prosecutor was legal and effectively discharged Mr. Cox at that time. This contention is also without merit. It is true that an agency has wide discretion in amending or revoking its regulations. *United States v. O'Brien*, 391 U.S. 367, 380 (1968). However, we are once again confronted with a situation in which the Attorney General voluntarily limited his otherwise broad authority. The instant regulation contains within its own terms a provision that the Watergate Special Prosecutor (as opposed to any particular occupant of that office) will continue to carry out his responsibilities until he consents to the termination of that assignment.¹² This clause can only be read as a bar to the total abolition of the Office of Watergate Special Prosecutor without the Special Prosecutor's consent, and the Court sees no reason why the Attorney General cannot by regulation impose such a limitation upon himself and his successors.

Even if the Court were to hold otherwise,

Footnotes at end of article.

however, it could not conclude that the defendant's Order of October 23 revoking the regulation was legal. An agency's power to revoke its regulations is not unlimited—such action must be neither arbitrary nor unreasonable. *Kelly v. United States Dept. of Interior*, 339 F. Supp. 1095, 1100 (E.D. Cal. 1972). *Cf. Grain Elevator, Flour and Feed Mill Workers v. N.L.R.B.*, 376 F.2d 774 (D.C. Cir.), cert. denied, 389 U.S. 932 (1967); *Morrison Mill Co. v. Freeman*, 365 F.2d 525 (D.C. Cir. 1966), cert. denied, 385 U.S. 1024 (1967). In the instant case, the defendant abolished the Office of Watergate Special Prosecutor on October 23, and reinstated it less than three weeks later under a virtually identical regulation.¹² It is clear that this turnabout was simply a ruse to permit the discharge of Mr. Cox without otherwise affecting the Office of the Special Prosecutor—a result which could not legally have been accomplished while the regulation was in effect under the circumstances presented in this case. Defendant's Order revoking the original regulation was therefore arbitrary and unreasonable, and must be held to have been without force or effect.

These conclusions do not necessarily indicate that defendant's recent actions in appointing a new Watergate Special Prosecutor are themselves illegal, since Mr. Cox's evident decision not to seek reinstatement necessitated the prompt appointment of a successor to carry on the important work in which Mr. Cox had been engaged. But that fact does not cure past illegalities, for nothing in Mr. Cox's behavior as of October 23 amounted to an extraordinary impropriety, constituted consent to the abolition of his office, or provided defendant with a reasonable basis for such abolition.

Plaintiffs have emphasized that over and beyond these authorities the Acting Attorney General was prevented from firing Mr. Cox by the explicit and detailed commitments given to the Senate, at the time of Mr. Richardson's confirmation, when the precise terms of the regulation designed to assure Mr. Cox's independence were hammered out. Whatever may be the moral or political implications of the President's decision to disregard those commitments, they do not alter the fact that the commitments had no legal effect. Mr. Cox's position was not made subject to Senate confirmation, nor did Congress legislate to prevent illegal or arbitrary action affecting the independence of the Watergate Special Prosecutor.

The Court recognizes that this case emanates in part from congressional concern as to how best to prevent future Executive interference with the Watergate investigation. Although these are times of stress, they call for caution as well as decisive action. The suggestion that the Judiciary be given responsibility for the appointment and supervision of a new Watergate Special Prosecutor, for example, is most unfortunate. Congress has it within its own power to enact appropriate and legally enforceable protections against any effort to thwart the Watergate inquiry. The Courts must remain neutral. Their duties are not prosecutorial. If Congress feels that laws should be enacted to prevent Executive interference with the Watergate Special Prosecutor, the solution lies in legislation enhancing and protecting that office as it is now established and not by following a course that places incompatible duties upon this particular Court. As Judge Learned Hand warned in *United States v. Marzano*, 149 F. 2d 923, 926 (1945):

"Prosecution and judgment are two quite separate functions in the administration of justice; they must not merge."

This Memorandum contains the Court's findings of fact and conclusions of law. The rulings made are set out in the attached Final Order and Declaratory Judgment.

GERHARD A. GESELL,
U.S. District Judge.

NOVEMBER 14, 1973.

FOOTNOTES

¹ At the injunction hearing, the Court dismissed Mr. Nader as a plaintiff from the bench, it being abundantly clear that he had no legal right to pursue these claims. *Flast v. Cohen*, 392 U.S. 83, 102 (1968).

² Referring to various bills pending in the Senate, Senator Moss stated, "I am severely hampered in my ability to discharge my duties because of uncertainty which exists with respect to the legality of Special Prosecutor Cox's dismissal and the abolition of his office." Affidavit of Senator Frank E. Moss, dated October 29, 1973. Congressman Waldie is a member of the House Judiciary Committee and both he and Congresswoman Abzug have introduced resolutions calling for the impeachment of the President because of the Cox dismissal and other matters.

³ The regulation from which the present Watergate Special Prosecutor, Mr. Leon Jaworski, derives his authority and his independence from the Executive branch is virtually identical to the original regulation at issue in this case. See note 13 *infra*. It is therefore particularly desirable to enunciate the rule of law applicable if attempts are made to discharge him.

⁴ 38 F.R. 14688 (June 4, 1973). The terms of this regulation were developed after negotiations with the Senate Judiciary Committee and were submitted to the Committee during its hearings on the nomination of Elliot Richardson for Attorney General. Hearings Before the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary, 93rd Cong., 1st Sess. 144-46 (1973).

⁵ See 5 U.S.C. § 301.

⁶ Justice Department Internal Order 518-73 (May 31, 1973).

⁷ See Defendant's Brief in Opposition to Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction, at 13.

⁸ Exhibit 12 to the Affidavit of W. Thomas Jacks.

⁹ 38 F.R. 29466 (Oct. 23, 1973).

¹⁰ See 38 F.R. 14688 (June 4, 1973).

¹¹ 5 U.S.C. § 301; 28 U.S.C. §§ 509-10.

¹² See 38 F.R. 14688 (June 4, 1973): "The Special Prosecutor will carry out these responsibilities with the full support of the Department of Justice, until such time as, in his judgment, he has completed them or until a date mutually agreed upon between the Attorney General and himself."

¹³ The two regulations are identical, except for a single addition to the new regulation which provides that the Special Prosecutor may not even be discharged for extraordinary improprieties unless the President determines that it is the "consensus" of certain specified congressional leaders that discharge is appropriate. Compare 38 F.R. 30738 (Nov. 9, 1973) with 38 F.R. 14688 (June 4, 1973).

[In the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia]

FINAL ORDER AND DECLARATORY JUDGMENT

Ralph Nader, Senator Frank E. Moss, Representative Bella S. Abzug, and Representative Jerome R. Waldie, Plaintiffs, v. Robert H. Bork, Acting Attorney General of the United States, Defendant. Civil Action No. 1954-73.

On the basis of findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth in an accompanying Memorandum filed this day, it is hereby ordered and decreed that:

(1) Plaintiff's motion for leave to file an Amended Complaint and add additional plaintiffs is granted.

(2) Plaintiff's motion for preliminary injunction is denied, and the trial of the action on the merits is advanced and consolidated with the hearing on said motion.

(3) Mr. Ralph Nader is dismissed as plaintiff for lack of standing.

(4) All injunctions prayed for in the Amended Complaint are denied.

(5) The Court declares that Archibald Cox, appointed Watergate Special Prosecutor pur-

suant to 28 C.F.R. § 0.37 (1973), was illegally discharged from that office.

LELAND A. GREEN,
U.S. District Judge.

NOVEMBER 14, 1973.

PRESIDENT DENT

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, for many weeks now, I have been trying to get the attention of the chairman of the General Subcommittee on Labor (Mr. DENT) about a minimum wage bill, but he has turned a deaf ear on this subject.

If you will pardon my French, perhaps he'll get the message in song:

Président Dent, Président Dent,
Acoutez-vous? Acoutez-vous?
Nous desirons une séance,
Pour des salaires minimum,
Pourquoi pas maintenant?
Pourquoi pas maintenant?

Translated into English, very loosely, of course, the message is:

Are you listening, are you listening,
Chairman Dent, Chairman Dent?
We desire a meeting,
About minimum wages,
Why not now? Why not now?

THE METRIC SYSTEM

HON. ROBERT McCLOREY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. McCLOREY. Mr. Speaker, with the advent of legislation to help coordinate the present drift of our Nation to the metric system of measurement, it is appropriate to inform the people of this country about some of the issues facing the passage of the legislation.

At the present time, in the House of Representatives the administration's metric bill (H.R. 11035) is locked up in the House Rules Committee.

Fortunately, while we have not officially, through Government sponsorship, started conversion, many sectors of the country have begun voluntarily to convert to the metric system. In fact, the optical, photographic, and pharmaceutical industries made the switch some years ago.

This country is going metric at an ever increasing rate with or without Federal legislation. The main argument for Federal legislation is that it will cost less to change to metric following a careful, coordinated plan than to continue our present drift. The Secretary of Commerce recommended 2 years ago that we change to the international metric system deliberately and carefully; the changeover to be a voluntary one to predominant metric usage; and that the changeover costs should "lie where they fall," which means that they will be borne by those benefiting from the changeover.

The trade posture of the United States suffers enough as it is without imposing such problems such as those associated with this country not using metric measurement, which is the language of measurement of most of the world.

The countries of the world that have not begun conversion to the metric system of measurement include: Barbados, Burma, Gambia, Jamaica, Liberia, Nauru, Sierra Leone, Tonga, Yemen Arab Republic, Yemen People's Republic, and the United States of America.

In this regard, an excellent point is made by J. Bryan Adair in his article "Texans and the Metric System," which was published recently—June 1973—in the *Texas Business Review*:

Of the top six major free-world trading nations, only the four using the metric systems for the entire period [1962-1969] increased their world market shares, with the United States and Britain experiencing declines (p. 130).

He also noted that historically countries using the metric system have made "heavy inroads on the American share of free-world trade."

Mr. Adair notes:

The loss of export trade experienced by Texas primary metals and machinery industries solely as a result of the presently used measurement system is estimated at over \$15 million per year at the present rate. The entire cost of metrication to Texas industry could be covered in less than 30 years by the savings in those two industries alone. Further, metrication will give Texas industry as a whole vast opportunities in foreign trade. The disadvantage in foreign trade will increase in the future unless this country adopts the metric system, particularly since many of our primary trading partners are forming trade alliances with other metric countries (p. 133).

What kind of conversion is now underway in this country? The Secretary of Commerce reports that—

First, many corporations have announced plans to go metric, for example, IBM, General Motors, Xerox, Caterpillar Tractor, Honeywell, Ford, International Harvester, Timken Roller Bearing, and so forth;

Second, the Nation's schools are increasingly teaching the metric system of measurement. The States of California and Maryland have formally announced conversion plans for their schools;

Third, several States have metric legislation under consideration by their legislatures and several have formed metric commissions. The California State Division of Oil and Gas recently announced a change to sole use of metric. Road signs giving distances and/or speed limits in both metric and customary units are appearing in several States;

Fourth, many key trade associations have adopted prometric resolutions. These include the National Association of Manufacturers, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce, the National Education Association, the American Home Economics Association, the National Grange, and the American Institute of Architects;

Fifth, the National Park Service recently announced plans to add metric designations to all of its signs bearing weights or measures as an aid to foreign visitors; and

Sixth, the military is now metric as are most of its suppliers.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Nation and its more progressive segments are not waiting for our plodding governmental machinery to catch up. They have taken the initiative to act upon themselves, much to their credit.

I think that it is appropriate now to look at some of the reasons why metric legislation is now being held up in the House of Representatives and what groups are actively seeking to achieve special monetary provisions.

As evidenced by hearings held by the Senate Commerce Committee—November 2, 1973—two groups are out to gain special favor. These two groups are the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations—AFL-CIO—and the National Federation of Independent Business.

The AFL-CIO is demanding that the Government provide compensation and adjustment assistance to workers for the cost of tools, the costs of educational retraining, and other conversion transition costs, including relocation, job loss, downgrading, and loss of income or promotion opportunities as a result of workers' lack of familiarity with the metric system.

The National Federation of Independent Business is seeking money and assistance from the taxpayer. The federation wants the Small Business Act to be amended so that it will "allow loans as the administration may determine to be necessary or appropriate to assist any small business concern to make changes in its equipment, facilities, methods of operations, or to retrain or educate its employees to conform to the national plan of metric conversion submitted under the Metric Conversion Act of 1973, if the administration determines that such concern is likely to suffer economic injury without assistance under this paragraph."

The AFL-CIO and the Federation of Independent Business are unnecessarily seeking aid. In fact, if they obtained the aid that they are seeking it may well destroy any Federal metric legislation. The fact that no other country in the world that has undergone conversion has found it necessary for such aid and let the costs fall where they may appears to have had little impact on the rather self-serving interests of these two groups. Any improvement in the economy of this great Nation brought about by metric conversion will only aid small business and giant labor, whereas the inability to convert in an orderly and deliberate manner with little or no costs will hurt both labor and small business. The reason for this is that without Federal legislation the undirected drift of metric conversion will almost certainly guarantee that conversion costs will be higher because of duplication of effort and other factors.

The Secretary of Commerce felt strongly enough about keeping Government cost factors low that he noted that the passage of the metric legislation without higher costs can only help the small businessman; that is, he will be able to make the necessary changes in a well-planned and thus more efficient

way. In the U.S. Metric Study's report to Congress it was stated that small business is the segment of our business and industry that is in greatest need of a coordinated metrication plan. Big business and industry have the "technical, financial, and managerial resources for planning their own metric changeover and dealing with it over a long period. Small businesses do not possess such resources."

The impact upon small businesses by the voluntary conversion to the metric system now underway in the larger corporations is tremendous, especially when one considers that, for example, General Motors has approximately 40,000 supplying companies. As the larger companies voluntarily go metric, even without legislation, the small companies in order to survive will by necessity be compelled to go metric to meet competition and fill orders.

Why forfeit such beneficial legislation by asking for unreasonable handouts?

Information that we have from the Bureau of Standards indicates that among those companies that have already begun conversion to the metric system, the policy has been for the firms themselves to assume the costs of all tool and equipment replacement, even worker-owned tools. This is the policy of General Motors, Ford, Caterpillar Tractor, International Harvester, and Timken Roller Bearing to name a few. Therefore, the worker does not have to worry about replacement costs in the sense that it will cause him undue hardship. How many foreign car specialists do we have in the country today that already own and use metric tools?

The Bureau of Standards notes that the retraining of workers has not been a problem and it is not anticipated to be a problem in the future. For example, the pharmaceutical industry converted to the metric system 20 years ago and it reports that the retraining of its workers was easily accomplished, much easier than initially expected. Other firms that have already converted report similar experiences.

Moreover, the Bureau reports that workers will generally need to learn only a small part of the metric system and that that portion can be learned in a few hours. No special effort or formal training is necessary. For the most part, industry accepts the responsibility and costs of retraining their workers.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, conversion to the metric system of measurement can only help this country, its businesses, and its workers. It will in no way hinder our international trade posture or cause economic hardship to befall our tradesmen, small businessmen, and workers in our domestic sector. We want to make this country strong and viable in the international marketplace. Such strength abroad can only make us economically healthy at home. One way to assure ourselves of this prospect is to bring about conversion to the metric system. The United States cannot afford to go it alone with such partners as Yemen People's Republic, Nauru, and Tonga, good friends that they are. In order to even compete with such industrial nations as Japan and the Common Market coun-

tries, we have to use the same form of measurement they use. If we do not, they very simply will not buy our goods or trade with us. Exclusive metric markets are being formed now. Also, they will set the metric standards for the world and we will have little or nothing to say about it. We cannot afford to place ourselves in such a position.

NOVEMBER 19—DISCOVERY OF
PUERTO RICO

HON. HERMAN BADILLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. BADILLO. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, November 19, the people of Puerto Rico celebrate Discovery Day, the 480th anniversary of the discovery of the island by Columbus. History tells us that on his second voyage to the new world, Columbus spotted the island on November 19, 1493. The following day he and his companions went ashore at Cabo Rojo and spent 2 days there acquiring fresh water and other provisions and enjoying the beauty of the tropical climate, clear waters, and swaying palms. Among the members of the crew was Juan Ponce de León, who later became the island's first Governor and who is well known for his exploits in search of the legendary Fountain of Youth.

Puerto Rico has long taken deep pride in the celebration of this occasion, and those of us who reside on the mainland continue to share in the festivities. The date is widely observed in New York City schools and affords us an opportunity to reflect on our Spanish heritage and on the diversity of our culture. But although we do recall the many different traditions which came together to form the present Puerto Rican society, we also recognize the need for unity and a sense of common brotherhood.

While the occasion is a happy one, those of us who are looking toward the day when the Spanish speaking can take their place as full-fledged members of our society cannot help but remember that there is still a lot to be done. More than a decade of civil rights activities has still not solved the appalling statistics which show that Spanish-speaking Americans, along with other minority groups, continue to receive less than an equal share of opportunity in education, housing, economic progress, health, et cetera. The present administration points with pride to the 16-point program which has raised Federal employment of Spanish speaking two-tenths of 1 percent since its inception in 1969. The poverty program has gradually been dismantled, and our citizens have experienced an all-time high both in prices and in unemployment. When even the middle-class American is suffering, what, then, is happening to the poor in the barrios of the cities and in the rural areas of the Southwest, both of which are heavily populated by Spanish-speaking Americans? And what is happening on the island of Puerto Rico itself, where we find the greatest single con-

centration of Spanish-speaking Americans? According to the 1970 census, the median family income in Puerto Rico is \$3,063; the median educational attainment is 6.9 years of schooling, compared to 12.1 years in the States, this in spite of the fact that the island devotes a greater portion of its total budget to education than any single State in the Union.

It is not my intention to detract from the spirit of this festivity by citing such discouraging figures. It is, rather, that I wish to stress the urgent nature of our problems and the need to act on them now. A lot has changed, both on the island and on the mainland, in the 480 years since that first recorded discovery. Columbus, if he were to come back to our shores today, would be amazed to find that we have built skyscrapers, designed airplanes, and extended our average life expectancy to beyond 70 years—more than double that of Europeans in the 15th century. But he might also be surprised to learn that we have not yet discovered a way to distribute these benefits equally to all segments of our population. Hopefully, we would explain that we are trying to approach our problems positively, that it is our firm intention to resolve the inequities we see around us.

On this date 20 years ago one of our greatest patriots, the then Gov. Luiz Muñoz Marín, delivered a moving speech over CBS radio describing the dramatic changes which have taken place on the island since its discovery by Columbus. Summing up the advances of a modern, technological society, he states:

We think Columbus, if he were to return today, would understand what we are trying to do. We would explain it to him in the language of Queen Isabella, although we could also explain it in the language of Sir Francis Drake if Columbus had gotten around to learning it by this time. He would see, we believe, that we are explorers, too. Just as he was an explorer in geographic space, we are explorers in the ranges of improving man's stay on earth. We are trying to push ahead the frontiers of man's knowledge. We are trying to apply it not only to making a better living but, what is more important, to making a better life.

We approach our multitudinous problems with courage born of the knowledge that we have traveled far on the rocky road. We face the future with the faith that man can and does rise above the pettiness of social position, racial differences, and local and personal economic interests to work for the common good.

We believe that not only Columbus would understand. We believe that all Americans to the north and to the south of Puerto Rico, representing the two great cultures that meet and grow friendly in Puerto Rico—trail blazers both in their different ways—will also understand.

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION'S GAR-
RISON DIVERSION PROJECT VIOLATES INTERNATIONAL LAW

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I commented on a North Dakota project of

the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation known as the Garrison Diversion Unit.

This project is a financial and environmental nightmare. It is opposed by many of the farmers it is supposed to benefit—and now it is creating an international problem. The project is in clear violation of a 64-year-old international boundary water treaty as well as the world environmental agreement signed in Stockholm last year.

To explain in detail the type of damage this project is causing the Canadians, I would like to enter in the RECORD at this point the full text of a letter from the Canadian Government to the U.S. Government. In addition, I would like to include the letter of transmittal from the State Department to the Department of the Interior. As this letter indicates, the State Department views this as a very serious matter.

Mr. Speaker, we must not press ahead with this project in light of all the environmental and cost/benefit questions which have been raised. There is absolutely no justification for this project to proceed. The further we proceed, the more it will cost us to correct the damage and terminate the program—and it must be obvious to everyone now that we must and will terminate. I urge the Department of the Interior to order an immediate end to the Garrison Diversion Unit before any more good money is thrown away on this project. The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,

Washington, November 5, 1973.

HON. ROGERS C. B. MORTON,
Secretary of Interior.

DEAR ROG: The Canadian Embassy has delivered to the Department of State its enclosed Note, No. 432, dated October 23, 1973. This Note reiterates Canada's strong and consistent objection to any further development of the Garrison Diversion Unit in North Dakota which could result in degradation of waters flowing into Canada. This Note goes beyond Canada's prior expressions on the subject and urgently requests that the United States Government establish "a moratorium on all further construction of the Garrison Diversion Unit until such time as the United States and Canadian Governments can reach an understanding that Canadian rights and interests have been fully protected in accordance with the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty" between the United States and Canada.

Canada's position is consistent with that which the Department of State has taken in its communications and discussions of the Garrison project with the Bureau of Reclamation. We think that the obligation of the United States under the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty should be very carefully weighed before further funds are expended on this project. The documentation delivered by Canada in support of its Note suggests that continuation of the Souris section of the project could result in pollution of waters crossing the boundary "to the injury of health and property" in Canada in contravention of our obligation under Article IV of the Boundary Waters Treaty.

I am aware that the Garrison Diversion Unit is a very large project and that substantial expenditures have already been made in connection with its construction. In view of Canada's protest, however, and the potential harm of continuation of the Souris portion of the project to our relations with Canada, we must give serious consideration to the Canadian request and to the circumstances and concerns which underlie it. To

resolve this matter, I would like to suggest that officials of our departments meet, along with other interested U.S. agencies, as soon as possible in order to determine what action should be taken in response to the Canadian Note.

Sincerely,

KENNETH RUSH,
Acting Secretary.

NOTE NO. 432

The Canadian Embassy presents its compliments to the Department of State and has the honour to refer its Notes No. 313 of October 19, 1971 and No. 35 of January 25, 1973, concerning the effect on water quality in the Souris River of the proposed Garrison Diversion Project in the State of North Dakota.

The Embassy reaffirms that the Government of Canada continues to be gravely concerned that return flows from the irrigation of land in the Souris Loop and areas adjacent to tributaries of the Red River will significantly and seriously degrade water quality in these two Rivers. The Government of Canada has concluded that based on studies conducted in both countries the proposal would run counter to the obligations assumed by the United States under Article IV of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 that: "... waters herein defined as boundary waters and waters flowing across the boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property on the other."

Studies have been undertaken in Canada that indicate that communities, such as Souris and Portage la Prairie, would be required either to seek alternative sources of water supply or undertake additional treatment of present water supplies drawn from the Souris and Assiniboine Rivers. The attachments to this Note contain more detailed explanations of the injury to property resulting from transboundary pollution likely to be incurred by these two Canadian municipalities. The Department of State will understand that the property damage values listed are indicative and minimum values and do not represent other injury to health or property that might be incurred. Such other injury by way of example would include: the unsuitability of the Souris return flows for irrigation purposes, and for various industrial uses including food processing; and adverse effects that may accrue to other downstream interests on both rivers from the Boundary to Lake Winnipeg. In short, options available to Canada for the use of the flows of these Rivers will be severely limited by the Garrison Division.

The Government of Canada is also mindful that on July 13, 1972 the Canadian Minister of Environment and the Chairman of the United States President's Council on Environmental Quality jointly reaffirmed their support for Principle 21 of the Declaration on Human Environment that:

"States have, in accordance with the charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law, responsibility to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction or control do not cause damage to the environment of other States or of areas beyond national jurisdiction."

The Department of State will recall that the group of Canadian and U.S. officials which was to consider alternatives to the present plans for the Garrison Diversion so as to protect Canadian interests, has met only once. No agreement could be reached as to the terms of reference for the group and thus no progress has been achieved through this mechanism.

The Government of Canada is confident the United States Government will recognize the need to avoid degradation of the water of the Souris River passing into Canada. Accordingly, the Government of Canada requests urgently that the Government of the United States establish a moratorium on all

further construction of the Garrison Diversion Unit until such time as the United States and Canadian Governments can reach an understanding that Canadian rights and interests have been fully protected in accordance with the provisions of the Boundary Waters Treaty.

The Government of Canada looks forward to an early reply to this request. Further, the Government of Canada suggests that senior officials from both sides representing all interests meet quickly, following the establishment of a moratorium, to reach the understanding described above.

The Canadian Embassy avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Department of State the assurances of its highest considerations.

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 23, 1973.

ATTACHMENT 1

N.B.: It should be noted that the statement below is illustrative only. The figures quoted are preliminary engineering estimates and do not cover the entire range of possible injury to health and property.

The forecasted degradation in water quality of the Souris River would appear to be serious enough to force the town of Souris to seek an alternate supply source. The availability of an alternate source was investigated by the Manitoba Water Supply Board during 1970. Their investigations revealed a potential groundwater supply approximately 8 miles from the town. The capital costs of development of this source and providing treatment facilities for hardness reduction and iron removal was estimated to be 470,000 dollars. Current costs may well be in the order of 600,000 to 700,000 dollars.

Water supply for the city of Portage la Prairie will not be affected to the same extent as the town of Souris. The Souris River will be diluted by the Assiniboine River, which is the city's water supply source. The forecasted increases in hardness and total dissolved solids will increase water treatment costs. It currently costs Portage la Prairie approximately 25 cents per 1,000 gallons to treat its present water. Chemical costs for treatment make up the bulk of this figure. Poorer water quality in the Assiniboine River will require the use of larger quantities of chemicals to provide the current quality of finished water. An increased cost of 10-15 cents per 1,000 gallons would not appear to be unreasonable. Assuming a 15 cent per 1,000 gallon increase and a daily use of 1.5 million gallons the annual cost to the city would be: \$82,125.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT.

OTTAWA.

GARRISON DIVERSION UNIT—SOURIS RIVER WATER DEGRADATION AS A RESULT OF IRRIGATION IN THE SOURIS LOOP

INTRODUCTION

On April 29, 1969 the Canadian Embassy in Washington, D.C. in a Note Verbale to the U.S. Department of State raised the matter of the Garrison Diversion, an irrigation project forming part of the Missouri River Basin Project, in order to determine if the possible effect on the quantity and quality of the Souris River waters flowing into Canada was being considered.

Since that time this matter has been the subject of several exchanges of notes between the Canadian Embassy and the U.S. State Department, and a matter of continuing concern to both the Canadian and U.S. governments.

The object of this paper is to outline the potential problems of water quality which the irrigation project will create, and give some assessment of the implications for Canada of a degradation of its water supply. Adverse effects on water quality in the Souris River of irrigation return flow

(a) Increased Concentration of Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)

The Bureau of Reclamation Environmental Impact Statement indicated that there would be a substantial increase in TDS in Souris River flow as a result of the irrigation project. The applied irrigation water from the Missouri would contain approximately 540 mg/l of TDS, the waters of the Souris historically have a TDS concentration of 796 mg/l, the return flow from the irrigation project would have about 1522 mg/l of TDS, and the average TDS concentration of Souris River flow would jump to 1322 mg/l. The figures for Souris River quality are perhaps not completely indicative of the potential problems because quality varies considerably from season to season and from year to year.

The predicted TDS levels would undoubtedly affect municipal use of the Souris River. The study predicted major increases in calcium and magnesium concentrations. Since the town of Souris, Manitoba, treats river water with a process which replaces magnesium and calcium ions with sodium ions the total concentration of sodium in the town's drinking water would increase from 239 mg/l to 344 mg/l on the average. High sodium content is a potential health problem. Indeed, the water might even taste salty at times.

Such a dramatic alteration in the water supply would probably not be calmly accepted by the people in the area. The changes in the taste and laundering characteristics of the water would be too important to escape notice.

It should be noted too, that certain industries may be very sensitive to changes in water hardness. No surveys have been done which would indicate the immediate impact of water with a high TDS concentration, but such an increase could affect existing industrial users and would certainly be considered by industries planning to locate in the area.

(b) Soil Leaching During the Initial Phase

The Bureau of Reclamation proposes that during the initial stages of the project leaching water will be provided "to flush the soil profile." During the introduction of the irrigation project the report predicted TDS concentrations would be considerably higher than after equilibrium has been reached.

In the early years TDS concentrations in excess of 2000 mg/l can be expected in the return flows. This would result in extremely high TDS concentrations in the Souris unless the irrigation project was developed and expanded only gradually. The Bureau calculates that approximately 20 years would be required before equilibrium would be established. This problem serves to emphasize the concerns mentioned in (a) above.

(c) Increased Nutrient Levels

The Bureau apparently assumes 100% efficiency in the agricultural use of fertilizers. While it is true that farmers try to use fertilizers efficiently because of their high cost, studies indicate that 100% efficiency is not attained in practice. The Great Lakes study found that 30-40% of nutrient pollution into the Great Lakes remained unaccounted for after the inclusion of all point sources. In Manitoba, a similar study of Lake Winnipeg found 70% of nutrient pollution was contributed by non-point sources; agricultural and urban run-off.

Nutrient loading of the Souris is already high, in part because of the many low dams and several duck reservations in North Dakota. Higher nutrient levels could result in increased plant and algae growth, thus complicating the task of municipal water treatment.

(d) Increased turbidity; increased temperatures

Canada expects that irrigation return flow will also have a higher concentration of suspended particulates than would be the natural flow, because of increased soil run-off. Because irrigation return waters are usually warmer than natural flows, algae and plant growth will be accelerated. Both of these con-

ditions would add to problems of municipal water treatment and other uses.

(e) Possible Trace Metals

Some trace metals, if present, could make Souris River water useless for certain purposes. For example, the presence of boron would make the water unusable for irrigation.

The most critical use: Municipal water supply

The first use to be affected in the event of water quality degradation is the use of the water by municipalities for household and industrial purposes. For this reason alone, the water quality to be maintained in the Souris should be that quality which does not impose additional burdens on the municipality or its inhabitants. This means, in effect, that any degradation of water quality is unacceptable because TDS concentrations and nutrient levels are already high.

While the fact that municipal water supply is the most critical use is sufficient reason to insist that water quality not be lowered, other considerations are present as well. Should the town of Souris be required to find an alternative source for its municipal water supply, it would have to pipe in water from wells eight miles away. Other towns along the river such as Wawanessa are presently supplied by local wells but will want to resort to Souris River in the future if they grow and well water supplies become inadequate. In short, other sources of municipal water are prohibitively expensive and limited in volume.

It could be noted, too, that Article VIII of the Boundary Waters Treaty of 1909 explicitly gives domestic uses of water precedence over irrigation uses of water, a further indication that it would not be appropriate to have municipal water users suffer a decline in water quality on account of an irrigation project.

Restrictions on future use

While municipal use of water is undoubtedly most critical, there is a wide range of uses in industry, irrigation, and recreation (in Lake Winnipeg) which could be restricted, made more expensive or made impossible as a result of the proposed degradation of water quality.

This final consideration points up very clearly the broad basis for concern over this irrigation project.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ENVIRONMENT,

OTTAWA.

VERMONT SETS AN EXAMPLE FOR NEW ENGLAND

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, unemployment and stagnation continue in many areas of New England, and in many of the industries on which New Englanders depend for jobs. This is in no way to imply that there is no growth in the area, or that every township is stagnant. In fact, many parts of the region are experiencing near-boom conditions. This prosperity, however, usually depends on the entry of new industry, or on the shift of old industries into new production areas.

One of the major challenges before us, however, besides the entry of new industry and the development of new technology, lies in finding the managerial or organization means to put the resources of

the old industries back to work. Unemployed but relatively skilled workers, vacant plants, idle equipment, unused natural resources—these can all be put back to work if we have the imagination and energy to do the work. Quite clearly, one of the best ways to increase the prosperity of the Northeast is to begin utilizing these resources again.

An article by Bradford W. Ketchum, Jr., "Vermont's Maple Business: The Pale Years Are Past," appeared in the November issue of the *New Englander* magazine. It is the story of what Richard B. Adams is doing to reinvigorate the maple sirup industry in this one small State. Here is an industry that has almost died recently, but in which one man with foresight and imagination has combined the resources that are available with modern technology and management to create more promise than has existed for decades. It seems to me that this is the kind of effort I have been talking about, and exactly what we need in our older industries to make a significant contribution to growth and prosperity.

The article is of sufficient interest, and Dick Adams' efforts are of such importance by way of example, that I would like to insert it into the *RECORD* at this time for the information of my colleagues.

VERMONT'S MAPLE BUSINESS: THE PALE YEARS ARE PAST

(NOTE.—New technology spells renaissance for maple industry. Key to its sweetest outlook in 40 years: Saltash, precedent-setting project to tap state forest for world's first automated sugarhouse.)

(By Bradford W. Ketchum, Jr.)

One of New England's oldest industries, it is also one of the few which puts environment first; it requires no land development, nor does it befoul air and water.

Its operations create jobs and revenues with minimal demand on town services.

There are no labor upheavals, no union contracts, and little potential for either.

The supply of raw materials is at record highs, and the resources are self-regenerative.

It is an industry in which young Turks are assuming leadership, where top management ranges in age from 35 to 42.

Its product, by tradition No. 1, corners at least one-third of the market; yet the industry is tapping only 5% of its total potential. Current demand far exceeds supply.

Capital requirements are modest and represent excellent investment opportunity. Through new technology, productivity and sales promise to soar 500% in the next five years; and, in at least one case, projected net profit over this period tops 19%.

The preceding are all illusions. No industry, particularly in New England, could have that much going for it. Wrong. Those are the realities of Vermont's maple industry, which, seemingly headed for extinction as late as 1971, now stands on the threshold of renaissance.

In the past 40 years, Vermont's maple sirup production has dwindled from more than 1 million gallons to 300,000 gallons annually—a relative trickle compared with 1935's peak of 1.58-million gallons. The industry has not enjoyed a million-gallon year since 1944, and last topped the half-a-million mark in 1961. Two years ago, it dipped to a record low of 240,000 gallons.

REDUCED TO A HOBBY?

The industry was evaporating—literally. Large bulk producers were unable to buy the sirup they needed, prices soared, and maple production appeared about to dissolve into

nothing more than an alchemic country hobby.

By its nature, Vermont maple sirup is the product of a cottage industry comprised of about 900 small producers—dairy farmers, ranchers, and assorted entrepreneurs—most of whom have never relied on the end product as their sole source of income.

They venture out on snow-custed February-March days, armed with pails and spouts, to tap standing sugar maples. They begin as weathermen and woodsmen, returning to rustic sugarhouses to become cooks and chemists. The largest sugar farmers, working full-time, manage 12,000 taps (about 1½ per tree); most producers, however, are in the 4-5,000-tap range. Each tree may yield up to 12 gallons of sap during the season, with 40 gallons required for one gallon of sirup. In short, it has always been a labor-intensive, rather than capital-intensive, industry. Until now.

The first production, scheduled for March, 1975, will involve 210 acres and about 15,000 taps, with a sirup goal of 3,500 gal. While Adams plans only a minor production increase the second season, giving him an opportunity to correct any bugs arising during the first effort, his goal for the fifth year is 15,000 gal. (60,000 taps). That does not include anticipated input from smaller producers who may deposit their sap or sirup with Adams to get in on the inaccessible bulk market.

"It's an exciting prospect," beams Adams. "Right now it takes one-and-a-half men to handle 4,000 taps. But soon we'll have one man handling 20,000 taps. And instead of averaging five gallons of sirup an hour, we'll be producing 100 gallons."

LOGGING'S IMPACT

The untapped potential of public maple stands becomes even more significant in light of recent developments in the state's logging industry. While Vermont is 75% forested (vs. 50% in 1900), there is a shortage of private trees.

Frequently, as sugarbushes went out of production in the 1950's and '60s, they were logged off, which, in effect, set the area back 40 years—the time required to generate a tapable sugar maple. In numerous cases, where logging was a prelude to a land developer's ambitions, the resource has been lost forever.

Also spurring the logging operations, perhaps more so than any other factor, has been the development of a bowling craze in Japan. Japanese interests seeking rock (sugar) maple for their alleys and pins, were signing deals at an astounding \$700 per 1,000 board-feet last year.

"Maple sirup is the best income-producing woods industry in the state," asserts Adams. "It produces about double the income that logging does, yet it doesn't create unsightly development. We can tap for 250 years, and the trees and natural beauty of the area will remain."

BIGGEST PROBLEM: LOGGING IN CAPITAL

Lest it be assumed that all is as smooth in the Saltash project as the product it seeks to produce, Adams is quick to point out that there are a few hurdles, not the least of which is capitalization. Depending on the SBA, Proctor Trust Co., and several small investors as current capital sources, Adams is convinced that he must go outside the industry and state to attract larger investors.

Recent technological breakthroughs, coupled with new marketing expertise, are distilling revolution in the Green Mountain maple industry. Plastic tubing and vacuum pumps have become a boon to the sugar farmers, now feeding their sugarhouses intravenously from the maple forests; while in marketing, the monopolistic grip so tightly held by two or three giant, bulk-buying food blenders has been broken.

KEY TO REBIRTH: SALTASH PROJECT

The result can be seen in 1972-73 production increases (a 43% gain over 1971) and the bulk prices earned (70¢/lb. vs. bulk buyers' 45¢/lb. bid). This year, retail prices ran \$10-12.50 per gallon.

But there's much more to the story of Vermont's resurgent maple business than the obsolescence of galvanized pails and dictatorial buyers. There is the pilot Saltash Mountain Project and its chief architect, Richard B. Adams, 38, of Cuttingsville, Vt.

Adams is constructing the world's first automated sugarhouse; not only will it become the largest maple operation in the U.S., it also sets a highly significant precedent: the trees which Adams will tap are located in Calvin Coolidge State Forest. It will be the first time that public lands have been tapped as a commercial sugarbush.

The idea is not original. Adams himself first tried to obtain permission through the forests and parks commissioner 12 years ago. Typical of most maple producers, he was at that point a dairy farmer working a sugarbush that had been in the family for four generations.

Sugaring since he was five, Adams attended the University of Vermont, where he earned a B.S. degree in agriculture via pre-forestry. It was there that Prof. James Marvin and Ray Foulds, forester, took him under their "maple wing" as he began experiments in tubing and evaporators.

After graduation and a three-year Marine stint, Adams returned to run the family farm and sugarbush, continue the maple experiments, and become an active leader in the State's industry (he is currently president of the 60-member Rutland County Maple Producers, one of three major groups in Vermont; a director of the Vermont Sugar Makers Assn.; and a member of the Vermont Maple Industry Council).

OUT OF THE DAIRY BUSINESS

Three years ago, he divested the dairy operation to concentrate on sugarbush management and technology. He had already perfected an oil-fired evaporator (he now has 15 operating) and had begun experiments in vacuum-pumping of sap. It was then that the seeds of Saltash were sown.

As Adams explains it, "I was bear hunting on Saltash Mountain one day and lost the dogs. As I was looking for them, I started counting maple trees and adding up the taps. It didn't take me long to see the huge potential there, and I decided to find out who owned the land."

It turned out to be the State of Vermont. Adams had been wandering through a 643-acre tract known as the Saltash Block, on the western border of Windsor County, in Plymouth, about 15 miles southeast of Rutland. It contains an estimated 50,000 sugar maples, "just standing there, waiting to be tapped."

It took time—for further experiments, official proposals, projected income statements, and bidding procedures—but on May 23, 1973, the Vermont Dept. of Forests and Parks notified Adams that he was the successful bidder for a 10-year, renewable lease on the Saltash sugarbush.

TAPPING ONLY 5 PERCENT OF RESOURCE

"There have been trees standing in state forests for generations, never contributing sap toward maple syrup production," stresses John D. Moore, area development director for Central Vermont Public Service Corp., Rutland. "The state has the resources to produce 6½-million gallons annually, yet we're only producing 5% of that. That is why the Saltash project is important."

At the recent dedication of a maple laboratory in South Burlington bearing his name, Sen. George D. Aiken (R-Vt.) put it another way: "Our maple trees have quit work and gone on welfare." Characterizing the majestic maples as "millions of beautiful loaf-

ers," the veteran Vermonter did have a serious point to make: only 12% of the state's standing maples are being tapped.

Adams is working under a land-use permit acquired by the Dept. of Forests and Parks and adhering to the provisions of Act 250, the state's land development and environmental control law which requires a permit for any activity above the 2,500-ft. level (elevation of the sugarbush: 2,300-3,000 ft.). The permit allows logging operations below 2,500 ft., thinning of trees above that level to improve the maple stand, and stipulates that no buildings will be constructed on state land.

The "improvement cutting" and logging, let by Forests and Parks, is scheduled to begin Nov. 1, and continue through early winter. Involving an estimated 178,000 board-feet, the thinning will create a stand that is 93% sugar maple.

Meanwhile, technological research will continue, led by Dr. Marvin at the University and coordinated by Lawrence D. Garrett at the Northeastern research station of the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture in Burlington.

EIGHTY MILES OF TUBING

Adams has drawn up blueprints for the sugarhouse and is working on the site and right-of-way. An experienced carpenter, licensed plumber and electrician, he will do much of the construction work himself. To be located in Shrewsbury, Vt., the 7,500-sq. ft., \$60,000 plant will be connected to the Saltash bush via 400,000 feet (80 miles) of plastic tubing which will feed four oil-fired evaporators. Sap flow to four 16,000-gal. tanks will be automated.

Vacuum pumps will eliminate the need for power lines or gasoline motors and, hence, the possibility of noise pollution. Adams has also guaranteed that there will be no hardware attached to the trees. Initial investment in the woods system (tubing, conduit, clamps, pumps, etc.) is expected to be about \$30,000. To preclude accidental release of oil onto the landscape, he will build a dike around the fuel storage tanks to be located beneath the sap tanks.

Estimated total need for start-up ranges from \$75,000 to \$100,000. While he anticipates losses in the first three seasons, Adams expects to tap black ink during the fourth and fifth years, generating a cumulative five-year net profit of 19.4%.

"I know we can strike an even balance between private and commercial investment, but the problem is who and how," muses Adams. "This operation would be excellent for an investment portfolio—it's ecology-oriented, in a well-established industry, with tremendous growth potential."

Another problem is expanding marketing expertise, distribution, and sales. Here, Adams is drawing on the resources of Central Vermont Public Service and the able counsel of Jack Moore, whose straight-pitch efforts have ranged from Pepperidge Farm and Howard Johnson, to Holiday Inns and Heublein.

EXPORTS AND AEROSOLS

Adams hopes to add a full-time salesman to cover select markets, such as quality food manufacturers, natural-food stores, food-gift firms, and corporate premium promoters.

Meanwhile, opportunity for exports is being explored. The latest development in this area is VM, a new liqueur which blends maple syrup and Scotch. The syrup is shipped by the Franklin County Maple Producers in St. Albans, Vt., to Scotland, where it is combined with the whiskey. (U.S. distribution to date has been limited.)

Packaging innovations—ceramic, aerosols, and portion servings—are other developments under study.

This January, the maple producers will meet with buyer representatives to work up prices for the coming season ("We'll be shoot-

ing for 68¢ to 72¢ a pound," notes Adams.) The fact that this will occur fully two months before the maple season is indicative of the edge the producers have gained.

Traditionally, buyers would wait until the crop was in, and then attempt to drive the price down. No longer. With some demand and larger economic units, the producers can control the prices their crops will bring before the season starts.

In short, there are few illusions about Vermont maple business in 1973. The renaissance is underway, spearheaded by new technology, and a pilot program that promises new life for a traditional product and economic growth from the environment while preserving that environment. It really is sweet; its future, sweeter.

TRIALS AGAINST SOVIET JEWS SEEKING TO EMIGRATE

HON. JOE MOAKLEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. MOAKLEY. Mr. Speaker, on Friday Aleksandr Feldman will go on trial in the U.S.S.R. on trumped-up charges which mask the real cause of his persecution. His only crime, like that of so many of his countrymen, is that he yearns to be free and has applied to emigrate to Israel.

On the eve of his trial, I would like to take this opportunity to share with my colleagues the comments of the National Conference on Soviet Jewry:

TRIALS AGAINST SOVIET JEWS SEEKING TO EMIGRATE

New trials against Soviet Jews seeking to emigrate are again being prepared by Soviet authorities.

In the last few months there has been increased harassment of Soviet Jews who have applied to emigrate to Israel. Now, for the first time since cancellation in June of preparations for a major "snow trial" against a large number of Jews in Minsk, Soviet authorities are again resorting to judicial repression and political trials against Jews actively trying to emigrate.

The trial against Aleksandr Feldman, a 26-year-old Jew from Kiev who applied to emigrate 2 years ago, is scheduled for November 16. He is being tried on trumped-up charges and is expected to be charged with "hooliganism", a catch-all category under the Soviet criminal code.

It is expected that trials are also imminent for at least two other well-known Soviet Jews who have applied to emigrate: Alla Myasoyedova of Moscow, whom Soviet authorities are attempting to coerce into implicating other Jewish activists; and Leonid Zabelshensky of Sverdlovsk.

The trial of Feldman and the possible trials of these other Soviet Jews, whose sole crime is that of seeking to emigrate, are a direct affront to, and a violation of, the spirit of U.S.-Soviet detente. Coming on the heels of the war against Israel, it is increasingly difficult for Americans to understand what Soviet leaders mean by detente.

The regime is apparently using the confusion following events in the Middle East and the Jewish communities' focus of attention on Israel in order to crack down on Soviet Jewish activists.

Attached is background material on the three Soviet Jews expected to be brought to trial.

Profile: Aleksandr Feldman.
Address: USSR, Ukrainian SSR, Kiev, Entuziastov 11/1/147.
Tel. # 447-871.
Born: 1947.
Status: Single.
Occupation: Did construction work in the army; presently unemployed.
Arrested: October, 1973.
Charges: "Hooliganism" (article #206 RSFSR Criminal Code).

On the eve of Simchat Torah, October 18, 1973, authorities searched the apartment of twenty-six year old Aleksandr Feldman, one of the Kiev "Four" (see OUTLOOK #7).^{*} Among the items reportedly confiscated was a book by Jabotinsky and the receipt from a letter to Israel.

Feldman, who applied for emigration two years ago, "disappeared" soon after the search. The NCSJ later learned that he had been taken into custody by the Regional Directorate of Kiev and is expected to be charged with "hooliganism" under article #206 of the criminal code. It is alleged that Feldman assaulted an unidentified old woman. A Kiev newspaper, *Vechernyi Kiev*, ran an article on October 31st that accused Feldman of the attack and judged him "guilty" even before any formal accusation was made. While authorities "promised" not to transfer Feldman to the Pavlov psychiatric hospital, relatives have not been permitted to see him or to send him warm clothing (as other prisoners' relatives are permitted) and internment in the hospital has been repeatedly threatened. The investigation is to end November 8, 1973; thus far, no lawyer has agreed to defend Feldman.

Profile: "The Moscow Conspiracy."
Parties "Involved": Alla Myasoyedova, Abraham I. Gelikh.

On October 1, 1973, KGB workers searched the apartment of Alla Myasoyedova. Since her husband left for Israel, Alla has been staying at the apartment of her father-in-law, A. I. Gelikh. Gelikh is 72 years old, spent 13 years in camps and in exile within the U.S.S.R. and, since his retirement, has devoted his time to writing a treatise on comparative economics, based on data obtained from public sources. During the search, accounts of Gelikh's prison experiences were reportedly confiscated and Alla was then called in for interrogations.

Now both individuals have issued statements to the press. Gelikh explained his interest in studying both the socialist and capitalist systems and Myasoyedova, subjected to intensive KGB (Security Police) interrogations, has denied any knowledge of the contents of the items confiscated. In addition, she reports, she is questioned for six to seven hours at a time, until she is exhausted. Authorities are attempting to coerce her to implicate other activists: David Azbel, Mark Nashpits, Boris Orlov. In particular, the authorities have sought to involve Tamara Galperina and Dina Bellina, both hard-core Jewish activists from Moscow.

Born in 1930, Tamara is a translator; she and her husband, Anatoly, a mathematician, applied for emigration in 1971. Dina Bellina and her husband, Josif, an engineer, have one child. They also applied in 1971.

According to Gelikh, "the interrogators are trying to intimidate Myasoyedova with the alleged espionage nature of my work only in order to wring out of her the confession required by the investigation." Myasoyedova admits she does not know how long she can withstand the pressure and wants everyone to know that if she implicates Galperina and Bellina in any trial, this "evidence" would be "untruthful and wrung out of me by threats and blackmail."

Addresses: USSR, RSFSR, Moscow B-61,

^{*} Of Feldman's friends, Zinoviy Melamed and Yuri Sorkoko have since received permission although Sorkoko's wife Basya has not, and the promise of a visa made to Yuli Tartakovsky has not materialized.

Cherkibovskaya 6-3-53, Bellina, Dina Tel. No. 161-42-28; USSR, RSFSR, Moscow 105037, Pervomayskaya 14-33, Galperina, Tamara. Tel. No. 164-75-82.
Profile: Leonid Zabelishensky.
Address: USSR, RSFSR, Sverdlovsk, Ural-skaya 48/99.
Born: 1941.

Status: Married, with 1 young son.
Occupation: Electrical Engineer, taught at Ural Polytechnic Institute (Sverdlovsk); field: theory of computer calculating.
Arrested: October, 1973.
Charges: "Parasitism" (article No. 209-1 RSFSR Criminal Code).

Little is known about thirty-two year old Leonid Zabelishensky. An activist in the small Jewish community of Sverdlovsk, he and his family applied for exit visas in November, 1971. On October 25, 1973, Zabelishensky was taken to an undisclosed place after being arrested by local police. It was later learned that he is being accused of "parasitism," although his wife works and earns a substantial income. Zabelishensky is currently taking care of their sick son. In a search of the Zabelishensky apartment, police reportedly confiscated a voucher from Switzerland, notification from a bank of a money transfer, and a receipt for a letter to Israel. The investigation is due to end in two weeks.

Other activists from remote Sverdlovsk include Valery Kukul and Vladimir Markham, both now serving prison sentences.

MOUNTIE BAND TO RECEIVE BICENTENNIAL FLAG SUNDAY

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, the Mansfield State College Mountie Band has been honored by the National Revolutionary Bicentennial Commission as the first college band in the country to be presented with the official flag of the Bicentennial.

This fine and spirited band, representing Mansfield State College in Tioga County of northern Pennsylvania, was so honored because of the promotions for this celebration which they have made in many appearances.

All of us are keenly aware of the fact that we are approaching the 200th birthday of America. We will, in a few short years, be able to celebrate the founding of this most remarkable Nation. It is a celebration that will encompass all of our country, and the work of this Mountie Band is an outstanding contribution to the cause of reminding all Americans that this birthday will soon be upon us.

I know my colleagues will want to join me in offering our warmest congratulations to the Mansfield State College Mountie Band and to its director, Richard N. Talbot. I am very proud to represent all the people of Tioga County here in the Congress, and I know that these people and all Pennsylvanians share the pride I feel in witnessing this singular honor.

Mr. Speaker, I will append an article from the October 18 issue of the Flashlight, the Mansfield State College weekly newspaper:

MOUNTIE BAND TO RECEIVE BICENTENNIAL FLAG SUNDAY

The Mansfield State College Mountie Band has been chosen as the first college band

in the country to be presented with the official flag of the bicentennial. They are being honored by the National Revolutionary Bicentennial Commission because of promotions for the celebration which they have made in their appearances. The band is currently displaying the bicentennial flags, but these are on loan and must be returned at the end of the season.

They will be presented with the official flag and give the halftime show at the Jets-Steelers game in Pittsburgh on Sunday, televised by NBC. The actual presentation of the flag to the band will be made by Thompson's Rifle Battalion, the first military unit to be raised during the American Revolutionary War.

The game was originally scheduled to be played at Shea Stadium in New York, but the New York Mets are still using the stadium for the World Series. The field could not be converted in time for a football game. The game, therefore, had to be changed to Three Rivers Stadium in Pittsburgh.

The Mountie Band is made up of 210 students eight students less than last year. According to Mr. Talbot, the rehearsals are easier this year than in the past. They practice two hours on Monday and Wednesday on their own practice field and on Friday an hour is spent practicing at Butler and another hour on Van Norman Field.

With Mr. Talbot, Mr. David Borshine also directs the band. On the field the Mountie Band depends on their student captains, Bruce Brindza, Colin Hughes, and Jim Farrell to lead them.

The halftime show which they will give at the Jets-Steelers game will be a shortened version of the program which they presented at the homecoming game.

The question most asked about the bicentennial is "Where is it going to be held?" The answer to that question came years ago when the drafters of the first bicentennial legislation said, "The bicentennial will be everywhere, in every city, town and village, all across the United States." This is the message that the Mountie Band will be trying to get across with their presentation and what better way to say it than to a captive audience of approximately 20 million people.

The bicentennial celebration will be national in scope providing opportunities for participation on the part of all Americans. It will be a time for review and reaffirmation of the basic principles on which our nation was founded.

The Mountie Band will also receive a certificate of recognition from the National Revolutionary Bicentennial Commission November 13 when they present a concert "A Night with the Mounties" at Straughn Auditorium.

During last season, the Mountie Band was exposed nationally for the first time with their televised halftime performance from Schaffer Stadium in Foxboro, Mass.

EMERGENCY OIL ALLOCATION CONFERENCE REPORT

HON. WILLIAM LEHMAN

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 14, 1973

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I missed rollcall No. 581 on the emergency oil allocation conference report due to an important meeting which concerned south Florida's future economic development.

I voted for the emergency oil allocation bill when it first passed the House and had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 581.